arXiv:1110.3885v2 [math.OC] 20 Oct 2011

Equivalence of three different kinds of optimal control problems for heat equations and its applications

Gengsheng Wang* Yashan Xu†

Abstract

This paper presents an equivalence theorem for three different kinds of optimal control problems, which are optimal target control problems, optimal norm control problems and optimal time control problems. Controlled systems in this study are internally controlled heat equations. With the aid of this theorem, we establish an optimal norm feedback law and build up two algorithms for optimal norms (together with optimal norm controls) and optimal time (along with optimal time controls), respectively.

AMS Subject Classifications. 35K05, 49N90

Keywords. optimal controls, optimal norm, optimal time, feedback law, heat equations

1 Introduction

We begin with introducing the controlled system. Let T be a positive number and $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded domain with a smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$. Let ω be an open and non-empty subset of Ω. Write χ_ω for the characteristic function of ω. Consider the following controlled heat equation:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t y - \triangle y = \chi_\omega \chi_{(\tau,T)} u & \text{in} \quad \Omega \times (0,T), \\ y = 0 & \text{on} \quad \partial\Omega \times (0,T). \\ y(0) = y_0 & \text{in} \quad \Omega, \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

---

[*] School of Mathematics and Statistics, Wuhan University, Wuhan, 430072, China. (wanggs62@yeah.net) The author was partially supported by National Basis Research Program of China (973 Program) under grant 2011CB808002 and the National Natural Science Foundation of China under grant 11161130003 and 11171264.

[†] School of Mathematical Sciences, Fudan University, KLMNS, Shanghai 200433, China. (yashanxu@fudan.edu.cn) This work was partially supported by NNSF Grant 10801041, 10831007.

Here $y_0 \in L^2(\Omega)$, $u \in L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega))$, $\tau \in [0,T)$ and $\chi_{(\tau,T)}$ stands for the characteristic function of (τ,T). In this equation, controls are restricted over $\omega \times (\tau,T)$. It is well known that for each $u \in L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega))$ and each $y_0 \in L^2(\Omega)$, Equation (1.1) has a unique solution in $C([0,T];L^2(\Omega))$. *We denote, by $y(\cdot;\chi_{(\tau,T)}u,y_0)$, the solution of Equation (1.1) corresponding to the control u and the initial state y_0.* Throughout this paper, $\|\cdot\|$ and $<\cdot,\cdot>$ stand for the usual norm and inner product of the space $L^2(\Omega)$, respectively.

Next, we will set up, for each $y_0 \in L^2(\Omega)$, three kinds of optimal control problems associated with Equation (1.1). For this purpose, we take a target $z_d \in L^2(\Omega)$ such that

$$z_d \notin \Big\{ y(T;\chi_{(0,T)}u,0): \ u \in L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega)) \Big\}. \tag{1.2}$$

The set on the right hand side of (1.2) is called the attainable set of Equation (1.1). Then we introduce the following target sets:

$$B(z_d,r) = \{\hat{y} \in L^2(\Omega) : \|\hat{y} - z_d\| \le r\}, \ \ r > 0.$$

For each $M \ge 0$, each $r > 0$ and each $\tau \in [0,T)$, we define three sets of controls as follows:

- $\mathcal{U}_{\tau,M} = \{v \in L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega)) : \|v(t)\| \le M \ \text{ for a.e. } \ t \in (\tau,T)\}$;
- $\mathcal{U}_{M,r} = \{v : \exists\ \tau \in [0,T) \text{ s.t. } v \in \mathcal{U}_{\tau,M} \ \text{ and } \ y(T;\chi_{(\tau,T)}v,y_0) \in B(z_d,r)\}$;
- $\mathcal{U}_{r,\tau} = \{v \in L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega)) : y(T;\chi_{(\tau,T)}v,y_0) \in B(z_d,r)\}$.

For each $u \in \mathcal{U}_{M,r}$, we set

$$\widetilde{\tau}_{M,r}(u) = \sup\{\tau \in [0,T) : u \in \mathcal{U}_{\tau,M} \text{ and } y(T;\chi_{(\tau,T)}u,y_0) \in B(z_d,r)\}. \tag{1.3}$$

Three kinds of optimal control problems studied in this paper are as follows:

- $(OP)^{\tau,M}$**:** $\inf\{\|y(T;\chi_{(\tau,T)}u,y_0) - z_d\|^2 : u \in \mathcal{U}_{\tau,M}\}$;
- $(TP)^{M,r}$**:** $\sup\{\widetilde{\tau}_{M,r}(u) : u \in \mathcal{U}_{M,r}\}$;
- $(NP)^{r,\tau}$**:** $\inf\{\|u\|_{L^\infty(\tau,T;L^2(\Omega))} : u \in \mathcal{U}_{r,\tau}\}$.

We call $(OP)^{\tau,M}$ as an optimal target control problem, which is a kind of optimal control problem with the observation of the final state (see [9], page 177). The problem $(NP)^{r,\tau}$ is an optimal norm control problem, which is related to the approximate controllability (see [4]). The problem $(TP)^{M,r}$ is an optimal time control problem. The aim of controls in $(TP)^{M,r}$ is to delay initiation of active control as late as possible, such that the corresponding solution reaches the target $B(z_d,r)$ at the ending time T (see [11]).

The above three problems provide the following three values, respectively:

- $r(\tau, M) \equiv \inf\{\|y(T; \chi_{(\tau,T)}u, y_0) - z_d\| : u \in \mathcal{U}_{\tau,M}\}$;
- $\tau(M, r) \equiv \sup\{\widetilde{\tau}_{M,r}(u) : u \in \mathcal{U}_{M,r}\}$;
- $M(r, \tau) \equiv \inf\{\|u\|_{L^\infty(\tau,T;L^2(\Omega))} : u \in \mathcal{U}_{r,\tau}\}$.

The value $r(\tau, M)$ is called the optimal distance to the target for $(OP)^{\tau,M}$; while values $\tau(M, r)$ and $M(r, \tau)$ are called the optimal time for $(TP)^{M,r}$ and the optimal norm for $(NP)^{r,\tau}$, respectively. The optimal controls to these problems are defined as follows:

- u^* is called an optimal control to $(OP)^{\tau,M}$ if $u^* = \chi_{(\tau,T)}v^*$ for some $v^* \in \mathcal{U}_{\tau,M}$ such that $\|y(T; \chi_{(\tau,T)}v^*, y_0) - z_d\| = r(\tau, M)$;
- u^* is called an optimal control to $(TP)^{M,r}$ if $u^* = \chi_{(\tau(M,r),T)}v^*$ for some $v^* \in \mathcal{U}_{\tau(M,r),M}$ such that $y(T; \chi_{(\tau(M,r),T)}v^*, y_0) \in B(z_d, r)$.
- u^* is called an optimal control to $(NP)^{r,\tau}$ if $u^* = \chi_{(\tau,T)}v^*$ for some $v^* \in \mathcal{U}_{r,\tau}$ and $\|u^*\|_{L^\infty(\tau,T;L^2(\Omega))} = M(r, \tau)$.

Throughout the paper, the following notation will be used frequently:

$$r_T(y_0) \equiv \|y(T; 0, y_0) - z_d\|. \tag{1.4}$$

The main purpose of this study is to present an equivalence theorem for the above-mentioned three kinds of optimal control problems and its applications. This theorem can be stated, in plain language, as follows:

- $(OP)^{\tau,M} \Leftrightarrow (TP)^{M,r(\tau,M)} \Leftrightarrow (NP)^{r(\tau,M),\tau}$ when $M > 0$ and $\tau \in [0, T)$;
- $(NP)^{r,\tau} \Leftrightarrow (OP)^{\tau,M(r,\tau)} \Leftrightarrow (TP)^{M(r,\tau),r}$ when $r \in (0, r_T(y_0))$ and $\tau \in [0, T)$;
- $(TP)^{M,r} \Leftrightarrow (NP)^{r,\tau(M,r)} \Leftrightarrow (OP)^{\tau(M,r),M}$ when $M > 0$ and $r \in [r(0, M), r_T(y_0))$.

Here, by $(P_1) \Leftrightarrow (P_2)$, we mean that problems (P_1) and (P_2) have the same optimal controls. Based on the equivalence theorem, the study of one kind of optimal control problem can be carried out by investigating one of the other two kinds of optimal control problems. In particular, one can use some existing fine properties for optimal target controls to derive properties of optimal norm controls and optimal time controls.

An important application of the equivalence theorem is to build up a feedback law for norm optimal control problems. We will roughly present this result in what follows. Notice that Problem $(NP)^{r,\tau}$ depends on $\tau \in [0, T)$ and $y_0 \in L^2(\Omega)$, when r and z_d are fixed. To stress this dependence, we denote, by $(NP)^{r,\tau}_{y_0}$, the problem $(NP)^{r,\tau}$ with the initial state y_0. Throughout this paper, we let A be the operator on $L^2(\Omega)$ with domain

$D(A) = H_0^1(\Omega)\bigcap H^2(\Omega)$ and defined by $Ay = \triangle y$ for each $y \in D(A)$. Write $\{e^{t\triangle} : \ t \geq 0\}$ for the semigroup generated by A. By the equivalence theorem and some characteristics of the target optimal control problems, we construct a map $F : [0,T) \times L^2(\Omega) \to L^2(\Omega)$ holding properties:
(i) For each $y_0 \in L^2(\Omega)$ and each $\tau \in [0,T)$, the evolution equation

$$\begin{cases} \dot{y}(t) - Ay(t) = \chi_\omega \chi_{(\tau,T)}(t) F(t, y(t)), & t \in (0,T) \\ y(0) = y_0, \end{cases}$$

has a unique mild solution, which will be denoted by $y_{F,\tau,y_0}(\cdot)$. Here χ_ω is treated as an operator on $L^2(\Omega)$ in the usual way.
(ii) For each $y_0 \in L^2(\Omega)$ and each $\tau \in [0,T)$, $\chi_{(\tau,T)}(\cdot)F(\cdot, y_{F,\tau,y_0}(\cdot))$ is the optimal control to Problem $(NP)^{r,\tau}_{y_0}$.
Consequently, the map F is an optimal feedback law for the family of optimal norm control problems as follows: $\big\{(NP)^{r,\tau}_{y_0} \ : \ \tau \in [0,T),\ y_0 \in L^2(\Omega)\big\}$.

With the aid of the equivalence theorem, we also build up two algorithms for the optimal norm, along with the optimal control, to $(NP)^{r,\tau}$ and the optimal time, together with the optimal control, to $(TP)^{M,r}$, respectively. These algorithms show that the optimal norm and the optimal control to $(NP)^{r,\tau}$ can be approximated through solving a series of two-point boundary value problems, and the same can be said about the optimal time and the optimal control to $(TP)^{M,r}$.

It deserves to mention that all results obtained in this paper still stand when Equation (1.1) is replaced by

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t y - \triangle y + ay = \chi_\omega \chi_{(\tau,T)} u & \text{in} \quad \Omega \times (0,T), \\ y = 0 & \text{on} \quad \partial\Omega \times (0,T), \\ y(0) = y_0 & \text{in} \quad \Omega, \end{cases} \tag{1.5}$$

where $a \in L^\infty(\Omega \times (0,T))$ and Ω is convex (see Remark 2.13).

The equivalence between optimal time and norm control problems have been studied in [13], [7] and [5] and the references therein. The optimal time control problem studied in these papers is to initiate control from the beginning such that the corresponding solution (to a controlled system) reaches a target set in the shortest time. Though problems studied in the current paper differ from those in [13], our study is partially inspired by [13]. To the best of our knowledge, the equivalence theorem of the above-mentioned three kinds of optimal control problems has not been touched upon. Moreover, the feedback law and the algorithms established in this paper seem to be new.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: Section 2 presents the equivalence theorem and its proof. Section 3 provides the above-mentioned two algorithms. In section 4, we build up an optimal norm feedback law.

2 Equivalence of three optimal control problems

Throughout this section, the initial state y_0 is fixed in $L^2(\Omega)$. For simplicity, we write $y(\cdot;\chi_{(\tau,T)}u)$ and r_T for $y(\cdot;\chi_{(\tau,T)}u,y_0)$ and $r_T(y_0)$ (which is defined by (1.4)), respectively. The purpose of this section is to prove the following equivalence theorem:

Theorem 2.1. *When $M>0$ and $\tau\in[0,T)$, the problems $(OP)^{\tau,M}$, $(TP)^{M,r(\tau,M)}$ and $(NP)^{r(\tau,M),\tau}$ have the same optimal control; When $r\in(0,r_T)$ and $\tau\in[0,T)$, the problems $(NP)^{r,\tau}$, $(OP)^{\tau,M(r,\tau)}$ and $(TP)^{M(r,\tau),r}$ have the same optimal control; When $M>0$ and $r\in[r(0,M),r_T)$, the problems $(TP)^{M,r}$, $(NP)^{r,\tau(M,r)}$ and $(OP)^{\tau(M,r),M}$ have the same optimal control.*

2.1 Some properties on optimal target control problems

Lemma 2.2. *Let $M\geq 0$ and $\tau\in[0,T)$. Then, (i) $(OP)^{\tau,M}$ has optimal controls; (ii) $r(\tau,M)>0$; (iii) u^* is an optimal control to $(OP)^{\tau,M}$ if and only if $u^*\in L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega))$, with $u^*=0$ over (τ,T), satisfies*

$$\int_0^T <\chi_{(\tau,T)}(t)\chi_\omega p^*(t),u^*(t)>dt=\max_{v(\cdot)\in\mathcal{U}_{\tau,M}}\int_0^T <\chi_{(\tau,T)}(t)\chi_\omega p^*(t),v(t)>dt, \tag{2.1}$$

where p^* is the solution to the equation:

$$\begin{cases}\partial_t p^*+\triangle p^*=0 & in\quad \Omega\times(0,T),\\ p^*=0 & on\quad \partial\Omega\times(0,T),\\ p^*(T)=-(y^*(T)-z_d) & in\quad \Omega\end{cases} \tag{2.2}$$

with $y^*(\cdot)$ solving the equation:

$$\begin{cases}\partial_t y^*-\triangle y^*=\chi_\omega\chi_{(\tau,T)}u^* & in\quad \Omega\times(0,T),\\ y^*=0 & on\quad \partial\Omega\times(0,T),\\ y^*(0)=y_0 & in\quad \Omega.\end{cases} \tag{2.3}$$

Proof. (i) and (iii) have been proved in [9] (see the proof of Theorem 7.2, Chapter III in [9]). The remainder is to show (ii). For this purpose, we let u^* be an optimal control to $(OP)^{\tau,M}$ and write $y^*(\cdot)$ for $y(\cdot;\chi_{(\tau,T)}u^*,y_0)$. Then it holds that $r(\tau,M)=\|y^*(T)-z_d\|$ and

$$y^*(T)\in\big\{y(T;\chi_{(0,T)}u,y_0)\ :\ u\in L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega))\big\}. \tag{2.4}$$

On the other hand, by the null controllability for the heat equation (see, for instance, [3] or [6]), one can easily check that

$$\big\{y(T;\chi_{(0,T)}u,y_0)\ :\ u\in L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega))\big\}=\big\{y(T;\chi_{(0,T)}u,0)\ :\ u\in L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega))\big\}.$$

This, along with (2.4) and the assumption (1.2), indicates that that $y^*(T) \neq z_d$, which implies that $r(\tau, M) > 0$. This completes the proof. $\square$

Lemma 2.3. *Let $M \geq 0$ and $\tau \in [0, T)$. Then, (i) u^* is an optimal control to $(OP)^{\tau,M}$ if and only if $u^* \in L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\Omega))$, with $u^* = 0$ over $(0, \tau)$, satisfies the following equality:*

$$u^*(t) = M \frac{\chi_\omega p^*(t)}{\|\chi_\omega p^*(t)\|}, \ \ \textit{for a.e. } t \in (\tau, T), \tag{2.5}$$

where p^* is the solution to (2.2), with $y^*(\cdot)$ solving the equation (2.3); (ii) $(OP)^{\tau,M}$ holds the bang-bang property: any optimal control u^* satisfies that $\|u^*(t)\| = M$ for a.e. $t \in (\tau, T)$; (iii) the optimal control of $(OP)^{\tau,M}$ is unique.

Proof. First, the maximal condition (2.1) is equivalent to the following condition:

$$< \chi_\omega p^*(t), u^*(t) >= \max_{v^0 \in B(0,M)} < \chi_\omega p^*(t), v^0 > \ \text{ for a.e. } t \in (\tau, T), \tag{2.6}$$

where $B(0, M)$ is the closed ball (in $L^2(\Omega)$), centered at the origin and of radius M. Since $p^*(T) = -(y^*(T) - z_d) \neq 0$ (see (ii) of Lemma 2.2), it follows from the unique continuation property of the heat equation (see [8]) that

$$\|\chi_\omega p^*(t)\| \neq 0 \ \text{ for each } \ t \in [0, T). \tag{2.7}$$

Thus, the condition (2.6) is equivalent to the condition (2.5). This, along with (iii) of Lemma 2.2, yields (i). Next, (ii) follows at once from (2.5). Finally, (iii) follows from (ii) (see [5] or [14]). This completes the proof. $\square$

Lemma 2.4. *Let $M \geq 0$ and $\tau \in [0, T)$. Then the two-point boundary value problem:*

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \varphi - \Delta \varphi = M \chi_{(\tau,T)} \dfrac{\chi_\omega \psi}{\|\chi_\omega \psi\|}, & \partial_t \psi + \triangle \psi = 0 & \textit{in} \ \ \Omega \times (0, T), \\ \varphi = 0, & \psi = 0 & \textit{on} \ \ \partial\Omega \times (0, T), \\ \varphi(0) = y_0, & \psi(T) = -(\varphi(T) - z_d) & \textit{in} \ \ \Omega \end{cases} \tag{2.8}$$

admits a unique solution $(\varphi^{\tau,M}, \psi^{\tau,M})$ in $C([0, T]; L^2(\Omega)) \times C([0, T]; L^2(\Omega))$. Furthermore, the control, defined by

$$u^{\tau,M}(t) = M \chi_{(\tau,T)}(t) \frac{\chi_\omega \psi^{\tau,M}(t)}{\|\chi_\omega \psi^{\tau,M}(t)\|}, \ \ t \in [0, T), \tag{2.9}$$

is the optimal control to $(OP)^{\tau,M}$, while $\varphi^{\tau,M}$ is the corresponding optimal state. Consequently, it holds that

$$\|\varphi^{\tau,M}(T) - z_d\| = r(\tau, M). \tag{2.10}$$

Proof. By Lemma 2.2, $(OP)^{\tau,M}$ has an optimal control u^*. Let y^* and p^* be the corresponding solutions to Equation (2.3) and Equation (2.2), respectively. Clearly, they belong to $C([0,T];L^2(\Omega))$. It follows from (i) of Lemma 2.3 that u^* satisfies (2.5). This, together with (2.2) and (2.3), shows that (y^*,p^*) solves Equation (2.8).

Next, we prove the uniqueness. Suppose that (φ_1,ψ_1) and (φ_2,ψ_2) are two solutions of Equation (2.8). Define u_1 and u_2 by (2.5), where p^* is replaced by ψ_1 and ψ_2, respectively. It follows from (i) of Lemma 2.3 that u_1 and u_2 are the optimal control to $(OP)^{\tau,M}$ and $\varphi_i(\cdot)=y(\cdot;\chi_{(\tau,T)}u_i)$, $i=1,2$. Then by (iii) of Lemma 2.3, $\varphi_1=\varphi_2$. Thus, it holds that $\psi_1(T)=\psi_2(T)$, from which, it follows that $\psi_1=\psi_2$.

Finally, if $(\varphi^{\tau,M},\psi^{\tau,M})$ is the solution of Equation (2.8), then it follows from (i) of Lemma 2.3 that $u^{\tau,M}$ (defined by (2.9)) and $\varphi^{\tau,M}$ are the optimal control and the optimal state to $(OP)^{\tau,M}$. This completes the proof. $\square$

Remark 2.5. The unique continuation property (2.7) for the adjoint equation plays a very important role in this paper. This property also holds for the adjoint equation of Equation (1.5), where Ω is convex (see [12]). With the help of this fact, one can easily check that all results in previous lemmas still stand when the controlled system is Equation (1.5).

2.2 Equivalence of optimal target and norm control problems

Lemma 2.6. *Let $\tau\in[0,T)$. Then the map $M\to r(\tau,M)$ is strictly monotonically decreasing and Lipschitz continuous from $[0,\infty)$ onto $(0,r_T]$. Furthermore, it holds that*

$$r=r(\tau,M(r,\tau)) \ \textit{for each}\ r\in(0,r_T] \tag{2.11}$$

and

$$M=M(r(\tau,M),\tau) \ \textit{for each}\ M\geq 0. \tag{2.12}$$

Consequently, for each $\tau\in[0,T)$, the maps $M\to r(\tau,M)$ and $r\to M(r,\tau)$ are the inverse of each other.

Proof. The proof will be carried out by several steps as follows:
Step 1. It holds that $r(\tau,0)=r_T$ and $\lim_{M\to\infty}r(\tau,M)=0$.

The first equality above follows directly from the definitions of r_T and $r(\tau,0)$. Now, we prove the second one. Let $\varepsilon>0$. By the approximate controllability for the heat equation (see [4]), there is a control $u_\varepsilon\in L^\infty(\tau,T;L^2(\Omega))$ such that $y(T;\chi_{(\tau,T)}u_\varepsilon)\in B(z_d,\varepsilon)$. Clearly, $u_\varepsilon\in\mathcal{U}_{\tau,M}$ for all $M\geq\|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(\tau,T;L^2(\Omega))}$. Then, by the optimality of $r(\tau,M)$, we deduce that $r(\tau,M)\leq\|y(T;\chi_{(\tau,T)}u_\varepsilon)-z_d\|\leq\varepsilon$ for each $M\geq\|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(\tau,T;L^2(\Omega))}$, from which, it follows that $\lim_{M\to\infty}r(\tau,M)=0$.

Step 2. The map $M \to r(\tau, M)$ is strictly monotonically decreasing.

Let $0 \leq M_1 < M_2$. We claim that $r(\tau, M_2) < r(\tau, M_1)$. Seeking for a contradiction, suppose that $r(\tau, M_2) \geq r(\tau, M_1)$. Then optimal control u_1 to $(OP)^{\tau, M_1}$ would satisfy that $\|y(T; \chi_{(\tau,T)}u_1) - z_d\| = r(\tau, M_1) \leq r(\tau, M_2)$ and $u_1 \in \mathcal{U}_{\tau,M_1} \subset \mathcal{U}_{\tau,M_2}$. These yield that u_1 is the optimal control to $(OP)^{\tau,M_2}$. By the bang-bang property of $(OP)^{\tau,M_2}$ (see (ii) of Lemma 2.3), it holds that $\|u_1(t)\| = M_2$ for a.e. $t \in (\tau, T)$. This contradicts to that $u_1 \in \mathcal{U}_{\tau,M_1}$, since $M_1 < M_2$.

Step 3. The map $M \to r(\tau, M)$ is Lipschitz continuous.

Let $M_1, M_2 \in [0, \infty)$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $0 \leq M_1 < M_2$. Let u^* be optimal control to $(OP)^{\tau,M_2}$. Then by the monotonicity of the map $M \to r(\tau, M)$ and the optimality of u^* to $(OP)^{\tau,M_2}$, we see that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& r(\tau, M_1) > r(\tau, M_2) = \left\| e^{T\triangle} y_0 + \int_\tau^T e^{(T-s)\triangle} u^*(s) ds - z_d \right\| \\
\geq \; & \left\| e^{T\triangle} y_0 + \int_\tau^T e^{(T-s)\triangle} \frac{M_1}{M_2} u^*(s) ds - z_d \right\| - \frac{(M_2 - M_1)}{M_2} \left\| \int_\tau^T e^{(T-s)\triangle} u^*(s) ds \right\|.
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $\dfrac{M_1}{M_2} u^* \in \mathcal{U}_{\tau,M_1}$, it follows from the definition of $r(\tau, M_1)$ that

$$
\left\| e^{T\triangle} y_0 + \int_\tau^T e^{(T-s)\triangle} \frac{M_1}{M_2} u^*(s) ds - z_d \right\| \geq r(\tau, M_1).
$$

Because $\|u^*\|_{L^\infty(\tau,T;L^2(\Omega))} \leq M_2$, we find that

$$
\int_\tau^T \|e^{(T-s)\triangle}\| \|u^*(s)\| ds \leq M_2(T - \tau).
$$

Putting the above three estimates together leads to the estimate as follows:

$$
r(\tau, M_1) > r(\tau, M_2) \geq r(\tau, M_1) - (M_2 - M_1),
$$

from which, it follows that

$$
|r(\tau, M_1) - r(\tau, M_2)| \leq |M_1 - M_2|(T - \tau) \;\text{ for all }\; M_1, M_2 \in [0, \infty).
$$

Step 4. The proof of (2.11)

First of all, by the definitions of r_T , one can easily check that $M(r_T, \tau) = 0$ and

$$
r_T = r(\tau, 0) = r(\tau, M(r_T, \tau)). \tag{2.13}
$$

Then, let $r \in (0, r_T)$. By Step 2, $M(r,\tau) > 0$ for this case. We are going to prove the following two claims:
Claim one: $r \geq r(\tau, M(r,\tau))$ and *Claim two:* $r \leq r(\tau, M(r,\tau))$.
Clearly, these claims, together with (2.13), lead to (2.11). To prove the first claim, we let u be an optimal control to $(NP)^{r,\tau}$ (the existence of such a control is provided in [4]). Then it holds that $\|y(T;\chi_{(\tau,T)}u) - z_d\| \leq r$ and $u \in \mathcal{U}_{\tau,M(r,\tau)}$. These, along with the definition of $r(\tau, M)$, shows *Claim one.*

Now we show the second claim. Seeking a contradiction, suppose that $r > r(\tau, M(r,\tau))$. Since the map $M \to r(\tau, M)$ is continuous and strictly monotonically decreasing, there would be a $M_1 \in (0, M(r,\tau))$ such that $r(\tau, M_1) = r$. Thus, the optimal control u_1 to $(OP)^{\tau,M_1}$ satisfies that

$$\|u_1\|_{L^\infty(\tau,T;L^2(\Omega))} = M_1 < M(r,\tau) \text{ and } \|y(T;\chi_{(\tau,T)}u_1) - z_d\| = r(\tau, M_1) = r. \quad (2.14)$$

The second equality in (2.14) implies that $u_1 \in \mathcal{U}_{r,\tau}$, which, together with the optimality of $M(r,\tau)$, indicates that $M(r,\tau) \leq \|u_1\|_{L^\infty(\tau,T;L^2(\Omega))}$. This contradicts to the first inequality in (2.14).
Step 5. The proof of (2.12).

One can easily check that $r(\tau, M) \in (0, r_T]$ whenever $M \geq 0$ and $\tau \in [0,T)$. Thus, we can make use of (2.11) to get that

$$r(\tau, M) = r(\tau, M(r(\tau, M), \tau)), \quad M \geq 0, \tau \in [0,T). \quad (2.15)$$

Since the map $M \to r(\tau, M)$ is strictly monotone, (2.12) follows from (2.15) at once.

In summary, we complete the proof. □

Proposition 2.7. (*i*) *The optimal control to* $(OP)^{\tau,M}$*, where* $M \geq 0$ *and* $\tau \in [0,T)$*, is an optimal control to* $(NP)^{r(\tau,M),\tau}$*.* (*ii*) *Any optimal control to* $(NP)^{r,\tau}$*, where* $\tau \in [0,T)$ *and* $r \in (0, r_T]$*, is the optimal control to* $(OP)^{\tau,M(r,\tau)}$*.* (*iii*) *For each* $\tau \in [0,T)$ *and each* $r \in (0, r_T]$*,* $(NP)^{r,\tau}$ *holds the bang-bang property (i.e., any optimal control* u^* *satisfies that* $\|u^*(t)\| = M(r,\tau)$ *for a.e.* $t \in (\tau, T)$*) and the optimal control to* $(NP)^{r,\tau}$ *is unique.*

Proof. (*i*) The optimal control u to $(OP)^{\tau,M}$ satisfies that $y(T;\chi_{(\tau,T)}u) \in B(z_d, r(\tau, M))$, $\|u\|_{L^\infty(\tau,T;L^2(\Omega))} = M$ and $u = 0$ over $(0,\tau)$. These, together with (2.12), indicate that u is an optimal control to $(NP)^{r(\tau,M),\tau}$. (*ii*) An optimal control v to $(NP)^{r,\tau}$, where $\tau \in [0,T)$ and $r \in (0, r_T]$, satisfies that $\|v\|_{L^\infty(\tau,T;L^2(\Omega))} = M(r,\tau)$, $\|y(T;\chi_{(\tau,T)}v) - z_d\| \leq r$ and $v = 0$ over $(0,\tau)$. These, along with (2.11), yields that that v is the optimal control to $(OP)^{\tau,M(r,\tau)}$. (*iii*) The bang-bang property and the uniqueness of $(NP)^{r,\tau}$ follow from (*ii*) and Lemma 2.3. This completes the proof.

□

2.3 Equivalence of optimal norm and time control problems

Lemma 2.8. *Let $r \in (0, r_T)$ and $M \geq M(r, 0)$. Then, $(TP)^{M,r}$ has optimal controls. Moreover, it holds that $\tau(M, r) < T$.*

Proof. We first claim that when $u \in \mathcal{U}_{M,r}$, the supremum in (1.3) can be reached, i.e.

$$y(T; \chi_{(\widetilde{\tau}(u),T)}u) \in B(z_d, r) \text{ and } u \in \mathcal{U}_{\widetilde{\tau}(u),M} \quad \text{when} \quad u \in \mathcal{U}_{M,r}. \tag{2.16}$$

Here, we simply write $\widetilde{\tau}(u)$ for $\widetilde{\tau}_{M,r}(u)$, which is defined by (1.3). To this end, we let $u \in \mathcal{U}_{M,r}$. Then by the definition of $\widetilde{\tau}(u)$, there is a sequence $\{\tau_n\} \subset [0, T)$ such that $\tau_n \to \widetilde{\tau}(u)$, $y(T; \chi_{(\tau_n,T)}u) \in B(z_d, r)$ and $u \in \mathcal{U}_{\tau_n,M}$. From these, (2.16) follows at once.

Next we notice that $(NP)^{r,0}$ has optimal controls (see [4]) and any optimal control to $(NP)^{r,0}$ belongs to $\mathcal{U}_{M(r,0),r} \subset \mathcal{U}_{M,r}$ (since $M \geq M(r, 0)$). These imply that $\mathcal{U}_{M,r} \neq \emptyset$. Thus, there is a sequence $\{u_n\} \subset \mathcal{U}_{M,r}$ such that $\widetilde{\tau}(u_n) \to \tau(M, r)$. On the other hand, by (2.16), $y(T; \chi_{(\widetilde{\tau}(u_n),T)}u_n) \in B(z_d, r)$ and $u_n \in \mathcal{U}_{\widetilde{\tau}(u_n),M}$. Hence, there exist a subsequence of $\{u_n\}$, still denoted in the same way, and a control $v^* \in L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\Omega))$ such that

$$\chi_{(\widetilde{\tau}(u_n),T)}u_n \to \chi_{(\tau(M,r),T)}v^* \text{ weakly star in } L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\Omega))$$

and

$$y(T; \chi_{(\widetilde{\tau}(u_n),T)}u_n) \to y(T; \chi_{(\tau(M,r),T)}v^*).$$

From these, it follows that $y(T; \chi_{(\tau(M,r),T)}v^*) \in B(z_d, r)$ and $v^* \in \mathcal{U}_{\tau(M,r),M}$. Hence, $\chi_{(\tau(M,r),T)}v^*$ is an optimal control to $(TP)^{M,r}$.

Finally, since $r < r_T$ and $y(T; \chi_{(\tau(M,r),T)}v^*) \in B(z_d, r)$, it follows that $\tau(M, r) < T$. This completes the proof. ☐

Lemma 2.9. *Let $r \in (0, r_T)$. Then the map $\tau \to M(r, \tau)$ is strictly monotonically increasing and continuous from $[0, T)$ onto $[M(0, \tau), \infty)$. Furthermore, it holds that*

$$M = M(r, \tau(M, r)) \text{ for each } M \in [M(r, 0), \infty) \tag{2.17}$$

and

$$\tau = \tau(M(r, \tau), r) \text{ for each } \tau \in [0, T). \tag{2.18}$$

Consequently, the maps $\tau \to M(r, \tau)$ and $M \to \tau(M, r)$ are the inverse of each other.

Proof. We carry out the proof by several steps as follows:
Step 1. This map is strictly monotonically increasing over $[0, T)$.

Let $0 \leq \tau_1 < \tau_2 < T$. We claim that $M(r, \tau_1) < M(r, \tau_2)$. Seeking for a contradiction, suppose that $M(r, \tau_2) \leq M(r, \tau_1)$. Then the optimal control u_2 to $(NP)^{r,\tau_2}$ would satisfy

$$\|\chi_{(\tau_2,T)}u_2\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega))} = M(r, \tau_2) \leq M(r, \tau_1) \text{ and } y(T; \chi_{(\tau_2,T)}u_2) \in B(z_d, r).$$

These imply that $\chi_{(\tau_2,T)}u_2$ is the optimal control to $(NP)^{r,\tau_1}$. Then, it follows from the bang-bang property of $(NP)^{r,\tau_1}$ (see Proposition 2.7) that $\|\chi_{(\tau_2,T)}u_2(t)\| = M(r,\tau_1)$ over (τ_1,τ_2). This contradicts to the facts that $\tau_1 < \tau_2$ and $M(r,\tau_1) > 0$ (which follows from $r < r_T$).

Step 2. $0 \le \tau_1 < \tau_2 < \cdots < \tau_n \to \tau < T \Rightarrow M(r,\tau_n) \to M(r,\tau)$.

If this did not hold, then by the monotonicity of the map $\tau \to M(r,\tau)$, we would have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} M(r,\tau_n) = M(r,\tau) - \delta \ \text{ for some } \ \delta > 0. \tag{2.19}$$

Let u_n and y_n be the optimal control and the optimal state to $(OP)^{\tau_n,M(r,\tau_n)}$, respectively. Then, it follows from Lemma 2.2 that

$$\int_0^T < \chi_\omega p_n, \chi_{(\tau_n,T)}u_n > dt \ge \int_0^T < \chi_\omega p_n, \chi_{(\tau_n,T)}v_n > dt \ \text{ for each } \ v_n \in \mathcal{U}_{\tau_n,M(r,\tau_n)}, \tag{2.20}$$

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t y_n - \triangle y_n = \chi_\omega \chi_{(\tau_n,T)}u_n & \text{in } \Omega\times(0,T),\\ y_n = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega\times(0,T),\\ y_n(0) = y_0 & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t p_n + \triangle p_n = 0 & \text{in } \Omega\times(0,T),\\ p_n = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega\times(0,T),\\ p_n(T) = -(y_n(T) - z_d) & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases}$$

Besides, by the optimality of y_n and (2.11) (in Lemma 2.6), we see that

$$\|y_n(T) - z_d\| = r(M(r,\tau_n),\tau_n) = r \ \text{ for all } \ n \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{2.21}$$

Since $\tau_n \to \tau$ and $\|u_n\|_{L^\infty(\tau_n,T;L^2(\Omega))} = M(r,\tau_n) \le M(r,\tau) - \delta$, there exist a subsequence, still denoted in the same way, and a control $\widetilde{u} \in L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega))$ such that

$$\chi_{(\tau_n,T)}u_n \to \chi_{(\tau,T)}\widetilde{u} \ \text{ weakly star in } \ L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega)). \tag{2.22}$$

This, together with the equations satisfied by y_n and p_n respectively, indicates that

$$y_n \to \widetilde{y} \ \text{ and } \ p_n \to \widetilde{p} \ \text{ in } \ C([0,T];L^2(\Omega)), \tag{2.23}$$

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \widetilde{y} - \triangle \widetilde{y} = \chi_\omega \chi_{(\tau,T)}\widetilde{u} & \text{in } \Omega\times(0,T),\\ \widetilde{y} = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega\times(0,T),\\ \widetilde{y}(0) = y_0 & \text{in } \Omega \end{cases} \tag{2.24}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \widetilde{p} + \triangle \widetilde{p} = 0 & \text{in } \Omega \times (0,T), \\ \widetilde{p} = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \times (0,T), \\ \widetilde{p}(T) = -(\widetilde{y}(T) - z_d) & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases} \tag{2.25}$$

In addition, it follows from (2.21) and (2.23) that $\|\widetilde{y}(T) - z_d\| = r$. By making use of (2.11) again, we deduce that

$$\|\widetilde{y}(T) - z_d\| = r(\tau, M(r,\tau)). \tag{2.26}$$

Now, we take a $v \in \mathcal{U}_{\tau, M(r,\tau)-\delta}$. Since $M(r,\tau) - \delta > 0$, it holds that

$$\frac{M(r,\tau_n)}{M(r,\tau)-\delta} \chi_{(\tau_n,T)} v \in \mathcal{U}_{\tau_n, M(r,\tau_n)}.$$

Then, it follows from (2.20) that

$$\int_0^T < \chi_\omega p_n, \chi_{(\tau_n,T)} u_n) > dt \geq \int_0^T < \chi_\omega p_n, \frac{M(r,\tau_n)}{M(r,\tau)-\delta} \chi_{(\tau_n,T)} v > dt.$$

By (2.19), (2.22) and (2.23), we can pass to the limit in the above to get that

$$\int_0^T < \chi_\omega \widetilde{p}\ , \chi_{(\tau,T)} \widetilde{u} > dt \geq \int_0^T < \chi_\omega \widetilde{p}\ , \chi_{(\tau,T)} v > dt \ \text{ for all } \ v \in \mathcal{U}_{\tau, M(r,\tau)-\delta,}.$$

This, along with the fact that $\widetilde{u} \in \mathcal{U}_{\tau, M(r,\tau)-\delta,}$ (which follows from (2.22)), indicates that

$$\int_0^T < \chi_\omega \widetilde{p}\ , \chi_{(\tau,T)} \widetilde{u} > dt = \max_{v \in \mathcal{U}_{\tau, M(r,\tau)-\delta,}} \int_0^T < \chi_\omega \widetilde{p}\ , \chi_{(\tau,T)} > dt.$$

According to Lemma 2.2, the above equality, together with (2.24) and (2.25), shows that $\chi_{(\tau,T)}\widetilde{u}$ and $\widetilde{y}$ are the optimal control and the optimal state to $(OP)^{\tau, M(r,\tau)-\delta,}$. Therefore, it stands that $\|\widetilde{y}(T) - z_d\| = r(\tau, M(r,\tau) - \delta)$, which, combined with (2.26), indicates that $r(\tau, M(r,\tau)) = r(\tau, M(r,\tau) - \delta)$. This contradicts with the strict monotonicity of the map $M \to r(\tau, M)$ (see Lemma 2.6).

Step 3. $T > \tau_1 > \cdots > \tau_n \to \tau \geq 0 \Rightarrow M(r,\tau_n) \to M(r,\tau)$.

If this did not hold, then by the monotonicity of the map $\tau \to M(r,\tau)$, we would have that $\lim_{n\to\infty} M(r,\tau_n) = M(r,\tau) + \delta$ for some $\delta > 0$. Following the same argument as that in Step 2, we can derive that $r(\tau, M(r,\tau)) = r(\tau, M(r,\tau) + \delta)$. This contradicts to the strict monotonicity of the map $M \to r(\tau, M)$.

Step 4. $\lim_{\tau \to T} M(r,\tau) = \infty$.

Seeking for a contradiction, we suppose that $0 < \tau_1 < \cdots < \tau_n \to T$ and $\lim_{n\to\infty} M(r,\tau_n) = M < \infty$. Let u_n and y_n be the optimal control and state for $(NP)^{r,\tau_n}$. Then we would have that $\chi_{(\tau_n,T)}u_n \to 0$ weakly star in $L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega))$ and $y_n(\cdot) \to y(\cdot;0)$ in $C([0,T];L^2(\Omega))$. Thus, it holds that $r_T \equiv \|y(T;0) - z_d\| = \lim_{n\to\infty} \|y_n(T) - z_d\| \le r$, which contradicts to the assumption that $r < r_T$.

Step 5. The proof of (2.17)

By Lemma 2.8, the problem $(TP)^{M,r}$ has an optimal control u. It holds that

$$y(T;\chi_{(\tau(M,r),T)}u) \in B(z_d,r) \quad \text{and} \quad \|u\|_{L^\infty(\tau(M,r),T;L^2(\Omega))} \le M. \tag{2.27}$$

From the first fact in (2.27), we see that $u \in \mathcal{U}_{r,\tau(M,r)}$. This, together with the optimality of $M(r,\tau)$ and the second fact in (2.27), shows that

$$M \ge M(r,\tau(M,r)). \tag{2.28}$$

Seeking for a contradiction, suppose that $M > M(r,\tau(M,r))$. Since the map $\tau \to M(r,\tau)$ is continuous and strictly monotonically increasing, there would be a τ_1, with $\tau_1 \in (\tau(M,r),T)$, such that $M(r,\tau_1) = M$. Clearly, the optimal control u_1 to $(NP)^{r,\tau_1}$ satisfies that

$$\|u_1\|_{L^\infty(\tau_1,T;L^2(\Omega))} = M(r,\tau_1) = M \ \text{ and } \ y(T;\chi_{(\tau_1,T)}u_1) \in B(z_d,r). \tag{2.29}$$

From these, it follows that $u_1 \in \mathcal{U}_{M,r}$. Then, by the optimality of $\tau(M,r)$, (1.3) and (2.29), we deduce that $\tau(M,r) \ge \widetilde{\tau}(u_1) \ge \tau_1$, which contradicts with that $\tau_1 \in (\tau(M,r),T)$.

Step 6. The proof of (2.18).

Let $\tau \in [0,T)$. By Step 1, it follows that $M(r,\tau) \ge M(r,0)$. Then we can apply (2.17) to deduce that $M(r,\tau) = M(r,\tau(M(r,\tau),r))$. By making use of Step 1 again, we obtain that $\tau = \tau(M(r,\tau),r)$.

In summary, we complete the proof. □

Proposition 2.10. (i) *Any optimal control to* $(TP)^{M,r}$*, where* $r \in (0,r_T)$ *and* $M \ge M(r,0)$*, is the optimal control to* $(NP)^{r,\tau(M,r)}$*.* (ii) *The optimal optimal control to* $(NP)^{r,\tau}$*, with* $\tau \in [0,T)$ *and* $r \in (0,r_T)$*, is an optimal control to* $(TP)^{M(r,\tau),r}$*.* (iii) *For each* $r \in (0,r_T)$ *and each* $M \ge M(r,0)$*,* $(TP)^{M,r}$ *holds the bang-bang property (i.e., any optimal control* u^* *satisfies that* $\|u^*(t)\| = M$ *for a.e.* $t \in (\tau(M,r),T)$*) and the optimal control to* $(TP)^{M,r}$ *is unique.*

Proof. (i) An optimal control u to $(TP)^{M,r}$ satisfies that $u = 0$ over $(\tau(M,r),T)$,

$$y(T;\chi_{(\tau(M,r),T)}u) \in B(z_d,r) \ \text{ and } \ \|u\|_{L^\infty(\tau(M,r),T;L^2(\Omega))} \le M.$$

These, together with (2.17), yields that u is the optimal control to $(NP)^{r,\tau(M,r)}$. (ii) The optimal control v to $(NP)^{r,\tau}$ satisfies that $v = 0$ over (τ,T), $\|u\|_{L^\infty(\tau,T;L^2(\Omega))} = M(r,\tau)$ and

$y(T;\chi_{(\tau,T)}u) \in B(z_d, r)$. These, together with (2.18), yields that u is an optimal control to $(TP)^{M(r,\tau),r}$. (iii) The bang-bang property and the uniqueness of $(TP)^{M,r}$ follow from (iii) of Proposition 2.7 and (i) above. This completes the proof. $\square$

2.4 Equivalence of optimal target and time control problems

Though the equivalence between optimal target and time control problems can be derived from Proposition 2.7 and Proposition 2.10, the properties of maps $\tau \to r(\tau, M)$ and $r \to \tau(M, r)$ are independently interesting and will be used in the next section. This is why we introduce what follows.

Lemma 2.11. *Let $M > 0$. Then the map $\tau \to r(\tau, M)$ is strictly monotonically increasing and continuous from $[0, T)$ onto $[r(0, M), r_T)$. Furthermore, it holds that*

$$r = r(\tau(M, r), M) \ \text{ for each } \ r \in [r(0, M), r_T), \tag{2.30}$$

$$\tau = \tau(M, r(\tau, M)) \ \text{ for each } \ \tau \in [0, T). \tag{2.31}$$

Consequently, the maps $\tau \to r(\tau, M)$ and $r \to \tau(M, r)$ are the inverse of each other.

Proof. We carry out the proof by several steps as follows:
Step 1. The map $\tau \to r(\tau, M)$ is strictly monotonically increasing.

Let $0 \leq \tau_1 < \tau_2 < T$. It follows from (2.12) that

$$M(r(\tau_1, M), \tau_1) = M(r(\tau_2, M), \tau_2). \tag{2.32}$$

We first claim that

$$r(\tau_2, M) \in (0, r_T) \ \text{ when } \ M > 0. \tag{2.33}$$

In fact, on one hand, it is clear that $r(\tau_2, M) > 0$ (see Lemma 2.2). On the other hand, since the map $M \to r(\tau_2, M)$ is strictly monotonically decreasing (see Lemma 2.6), it holds that $r(\tau_2, M) < r(\tau_2, 0) = \|y(T; 0) - z_d\| = r_T$. Then by (2.33), we can apply Lemma 2.9 to get that $M(r(\tau_2, M), \tau_2) > M(r(\tau_2, M), \tau_1)$. This, together with (2.32), yields that

$$M(r(\tau_1, M), \tau_1) > M(r(\tau_2, M), \tau_1). \tag{2.34}$$

Since the map $r \to M(r, \tau_1)$ is strictly monotonically decreasing (see Lemma 2.6), it follows from (2.34) that $r(\tau_1, M) < r(\tau_2, M)$.
Step 2. The map $\tau \to r(\tau, M)$ is continuous.

Since for each $\tau \in [0,T)$, the map $r \to M(r,\tau)$ is continuous and monotonic over $(0,r_T)$ (see Lemma 2.6), and for each $r \in (0,r_T)$, the map $\tau \to M(r,\tau)$ is continuous (and monotonic) over $[0,T)$ (see Lemma 2.9), it follows that

$$\text{the map } (r,\tau) \to M(r,\tau) \text{ is continuous over } (0,r_T)\times[0,T). \tag{2.35}$$

Now we prove that the map $\tau \to r(\tau,M)$ is continuous from left. For this purpose, we let $0 \le \tau_1 < \tau_2 < \cdots < \tau_n \to \tau < T$. Then by the monotonicity of $\{\tau_n\}$, $\lim_{n\to\infty} r(\tau_n,M)$ exists. Thus, it follows from (2.35) that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} M(r(\tau_n,M),\tau_n) = M(\lim_{n\to\infty} r(\tau_n,M),\tau).$$

On the other hand, by (2.12), it stands that

$$M(r(\tau_n,M),\tau_n) = M = M(r(\tau,M),\tau) \text{ for all } n.$$

These yield that $M(\lim_{n\to\infty} r(\tau_n,M),\tau) = M(r(\tau,M),\tau)$. This, together with the strict monotonicity of the map $r \to M(r,\tau)$ (see Lemma 2.6), indicates that $\lim_{n\to\infty} r(\tau_n,M) = r(\tau,M)$. Thus, the map $\tau \to r(\tau,M)$ is continuous from left. Similarly, we can prove that it is continuous from right.

Step 3. It holds that $\lim_{\tau\to T} r(\tau,M) = r_T$.

Clearly, the optimal control u_τ to $(OP)^{\tau,M}$ satisfies that $\|y(T;\chi_{(\tau,T)}u_\tau) - z_d\| = r(\tau,M)$ and $\|u_\tau\|_{L^\infty(\tau,T;L^2(\Omega))} \le M$. One can easily see that $\chi_{(\tau,T)}u_\tau \to 0$ in $L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega))$ as τ tends to T, from which, it follows that $y(T;\chi_{(0,T)}u_\tau) \to y(T;0)$ as τ tends to T. Therefore, it holds that $r_T \equiv \|y(T;0) - z_d\| = \lim_{\tau\to T}\|y(T;\chi_{(0,T)}u_\tau) - z_d\| = \lim_{\tau\to T} r(\tau,M)$.

Step 4. The proof of (2.30) and (2.31).

We start with proving the following:

$$\mathcal{A}_1 = \mathcal{A}_2, \tag{2.36}$$

where $\mathcal{A}_1 = \{(M,r) : r \in (0,r_T), M \ge M(r,0)\}$ and $\mathcal{A}_2 = \{(M,r) : M > 0, r \in [r(0,M),r_T)\}$. In fact, if $(M,r) \in \mathcal{A}_1$, since $r > 0$, it follows that $M > 0$. On the other hand, because $M \ge M(r,0)$, we can apply Lemma 2.6 to get that $r(0,M) \ge r(0,M(r,0)) = r$. Thus, it stands that $(M,r) \in \mathcal{A}_2$. Similarly, we can prove that $\mathcal{A}_2 \subset \mathcal{A}_1$.

Next, it follows from (2.36) and (2.17) that $M = M(r,\tau(M,r))$ when $M > 0$ and $r \in [r(0,M),r_T)$. This, together with (2.11), indicates that

$$r(\tau(M,r),M) = r(\tau(M,r),M(r,\tau(M,r))) = r \text{ for each } r \in [r(0,M),r_T),$$

which leads to (2.30).

Finally, because $r(\tau,M) \in (0,r_T)$ (see (2.33)), we can make use of (2.18) to get that $\tau(M(r(\tau,M),\tau),r(\tau,M)) = \tau$, which, along with (2.12), gives (2.31).

In summary, we complete the proof. □

Proposition 2.12. *The optimal control to* $(TP)^{M,r}$*, where* $M > 0$ *and* $r \in [r(0, M), r_T)$*, is the optimal control to* $(OP)^{\tau(M,r),M}$*. Conversely, the optimal control to* $(OP)^{\tau,M}$*, where* $M > 0$ *and* $\tau \in [0, T)$*, is the optimal control to* $(TP)^{M,r(\tau,M)}$*.*

This proposition can be directly derived from Lemma 2.11. Also it is a consequence of Proposition 2.7, Proposition 2.10 and (2.36). We omit its proof.

2.5 Proof of Theorem 2.1

Let (P_1) and (P_2) be two optimal control problems. By $(P_1) \Rightarrow (P_2)$, we mean that the optimal control to (P_1) is the optimal control to (P_2). The proof will be carried out by several steps as follows:
Step 1. $(OP)^{\tau,M} \Rightarrow (TP)^{M,r(\tau,M)} \Rightarrow (NP)^{r(\tau,M),\tau} \Rightarrow (OP)^{\tau,M}$, $M > 0$, $\tau \in [0, T)$.

$(OP)^{\tau,M} \Rightarrow (TP)^{M,r(\tau,M)}$: It follows from Proposition 2.7.

$(TP)^{M,r(\tau,M)} \Rightarrow (NP)^{r(\tau,M),\tau}$: We first claim that

$$r(\tau, M) \in (0, r_T) \text{ when } M > 0 \text{ and } \tau \in [0, T). \tag{2.37}$$

In fact, it follows from Lemma 2.2 that $r(\tau, M) > 0$. On the other hand, since $M > 0$ and the map $M \to r(\tau, M)$ is strictly monotonically decreasing (see Lemma 2.6), it holds that $r(\tau, M) < r(0, \tau) = r_T$. These lead to (2.37).

We next claim that

$$M \geq M(r(\tau, M), 0) \text{ when } M > 0 \text{ and } \tau \in [0, T). \tag{2.38}$$

Indeed, since the map $\tau \to r(\tau, M)$ is monotonically increasing (see Lemma 2.9), it holds that $r(0, M) \leq r(\tau, M)$. Because the map $r \to M(r, 0)$ is monotonically decreasing (see Lemma 2.6), it stands that $M(r(0, M), 0) \geq M(r(\tau, M), 0)$. This, combined with (2.12), shows (2.38). Now, by (2.37) and (2.38), we can apply Proposition 2.10, together with (2.18), to get $(TP)^{M,r(\tau,M)} \Rightarrow (NP)^{r(\tau,M),\tau}$.

$(NP)^{r(\tau,M),\tau} \Rightarrow (OP)^{\tau,M}$: By (2.37), we can make use of Proposition 2.7, together with (2.12), to get $(NP)^{r(\tau,M),\tau} \Rightarrow (OP)^{\tau,M}$.

Step 2. $(NP)^{r,\tau} \Rightarrow (OP)^{\tau,M(r,\tau)} \Rightarrow (TP)^{M(r,\tau),r} \Rightarrow (NP)^{r,\tau}$, $r \in (0, r_T)$, $\tau \in [0, T)$.

$(NP)^{r,\tau} \Rightarrow (OP)^{\tau,M(r,\tau)}$: It follows from Proposition 2.7.

$(OP)^{\tau,M(r,\tau)} \Rightarrow (TP)^{M(r,\tau),r}$: We first claim that

$$M(r,\tau) > 0 \text{ when } r \in (0, r_T) \text{ and } \tau \in [0,T). \tag{2.39}$$

In fact, since $r_T = \|y(T;0) - z_d\|$, it holds that $M(r_T, \tau) = 0$. On the other hand, since $r < r_T$ and the map $r \to M(r,\tau)$ is strictly monotonically decreasing (see Lemma 2.6), we see that $M(r,\tau) > M(r_T,\tau)$. Thus, (2.39) follows immediately. Now, by (2.39), we can apply Proposition 2.12, along with (2.11), to derive $(OP)^{\tau,M(r,\tau)} \Rightarrow (TP)^{M(r,\tau),r}$.

$(TP)^{M(r,\tau),r} \Rightarrow (NP)^{r,\tau}$: Since $r \in (0, r_T)$, the map $\tau \to M(r,\tau)$ is monotonically increasing (see Lemma 2.9). Thus, it holds that $M(r,\tau) \geq M(r,0)$. Then we can make use of Proposition 2.10, together with (2.18), to yield $(TP)^{M(r,\tau),r} \Rightarrow (NP)^{r,\tau}$.

Step 3. $(TP)^{M,r} \Rightarrow (NP)^{r,\tau(M,r)} \Rightarrow (OP)^{\tau(M,r),M} \Rightarrow (TP)^{M,r}$, $M > 0$, $r \in [r(0,M), r_T)$.

$(TP)^{M,r} \Rightarrow (NP)^{r,\tau(M,r)}$: It follows from (2.36) and Proposition 2.10.

$(NP)^{r,\tau(M,r)} \Rightarrow (OP)^{\tau(M,r),M}$: Since $r > 0$ in this case (see (2.36)), we can apply Proposition 2.7, together with (2.12), to get $(NP)^{r,\tau(M,r)} \Rightarrow (OP)^{\tau(M,r),M}$.

$(OP)^{\tau(M,r),M} \Rightarrow (TP)^{M,r}$: It follows from Proposition 2.12, together with (2.30).

In summary, we complete the proof of Theorem 2.1. □

Remark 2.13. All results in this section hold for the case where the controlled system is Equation (1.5). In fact, these results hold for the three kinds of optimal control problems studied in this paper, when the adjoint equation of the controlled heat equation has the unique continuation property (2.7).

3 Applications I: Algorithms for $M(r,\tau)$ and $\tau(M,r)$

Throughout this section, we fix an initial state $y_0 \in L^2(\Omega)$ and write r_T for $r_T(y_0)$. For each $M > 0$ and $\tau \in [0,T)$, $(\varphi^{\tau,M}, \psi^{\tau,M})$ denotes the unique solution to the two-point boundary value problem (2.8) and $\varphi^{\tau,M}$ (or $\psi^{\tau,M}$)) stands for the first (or second) component of this solution when it appears alone.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $\tau \in [0,T)$ and $r \in (0, r_T)$. Then M^*, u^* and y^* are the optimal norm, the optimal control and the optimal state to $(NP)^{r,\tau}$ if and only if M^*, u^* and y^* satisfy that $M^* > 0$,*

$$\|y^*(T) - z_d\| = r, \tag{3.1}$$

$$u^*(t) = M^* \chi_{(\tau,T)}(t) \frac{\chi_\omega \psi^{\tau,M^*}(t)}{\|\chi_\omega \psi^{\tau,M^*}(t)\|}, \;\; t \in [\tau, T) \tag{3.2}$$

and

$$y^*(t) = \varphi^{\tau,M^*}(t), \;\; t \in [0, T]. \tag{3.3}$$

Proof. Suppose that M^*, u^* and y^* are the optimal norm, the optimal control and the optimal state to $(NP)^{r,\tau}$. Clearly, $M^* = M(r, \tau)$. It follows from Lemma 2.6 that $M(r, \tau) > M(r_T, \tau)$. Hence, $M^* > 0$. Then, by Theorem 2.1, u^* and y^* are the optimal control and the optimal state to $(OP)^{\tau,M(r,\tau)} = (OP)^{\tau,M^*}$, respectively. On the other hand, it follows from Lemma 2.4 that $M^* \chi_{(\tau,T)} \frac{\chi_\omega \psi^{\tau,M^*}}{\|\chi_\omega \psi^{\tau,M^*}\|}$ and y^{τ,M^*} are also the optimal control and the optimal state to $(OP)^{\tau,M^*}$. Then, by the uniqueness of the optimal control to this problem, (3.2) and (3.3) follow at once. Besides, by the optimality of y^* to $(OP)^{\tau,M(r,\tau)}$, we see that $\|y^*(T) - z_d\| = r(\tau, M(r, \tau))$. This, together with (2.11), gives (3.1).

Conversely, suppose that a triplet (M^*, u^*, y^*), with $M^* > 0$, enjoys (3.1), (3.2) and (3.3). According to Lemma 2.4, it follows from (3.2) and (3.3) that u^* and y^* are the optimal control and the optimal state to $(OP)^{\tau,M^*}$ and that $\|y^*(T) - z_d\| = r(M^*, \tau)$, which, together with (3.1), shows that $r = r(M^*, \tau)$. Then, by Theorem 2.1, u^* and y^* are the optimal control and the optimal state to $(NP)^{r(M^*,\tau),\tau} = (NP)^{r,\tau}$. Hence, $\|u^*\|_{L^\infty(\tau,T;L^2(\Omega))} = M(r, \tau)$, which, along with (3.2), indicates that $M^* = M(r, \tau)$, i.e., M^* is the optimal norm to $(NP)^{r,\tau}$. This completes the proof. □

By Theorem 2.1, Lemma 2.4 and Lemma 2.11, following a very similar argument used to prove Proposition 3.1, we can verify the following property for $(TP)^{M,r}$.

Proposition 3.2. *Let $r \in (0, r_T)$ and $M \geq M(r, 0)$. Then τ^*, u^* and y^* are the optimal time, the optimal control and the optimal state to $(TP)^{M,r}$ if and only if τ^*, u^* and y^* satisfy that $\tau^* \in [0, T)$,*

$$\|y^*(T) - z_d\| = r,$$

$$u^*(t) = M \chi_{(\tau^*,T)}(t) \frac{\chi_\omega \psi^{\tau^*,M}(t)}{\|\chi_\omega \psi^{\tau^*,M}(t)\|}, \;\; t \in (\tau^*, T)$$

and

$$y^*(t) = \varphi^{\tau^*,M}(t), \;\; t \in [0, T].$$

The above two propositions not only are independently interesting, but also hint us to find two algorithms for the optimal norm, together with the optimal control, to $(NP)^{r,\tau}$ and the optimal time, along with the optimal control, to $(TP)^{M,r}$, respectively. First of all, we build up, corresponding to each $r \in (0, r_T)$ and each $\tau \in (0, T)$, a sequence of numbers as follows:

- **Structure of $\{M_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$:** Let $M_0 > 0$ be arbitrarily taken. Let $K \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that

  $$K = \min\{k : r(\tau, kM_0) < r, k = 1, 2, \cdots\}.$$

  (The existence of such a K is guaranteed by Lemma 2.6.) Set $a_0 = 0$ and $b_0 = KM_0$. Write $M_1 = \dfrac{a_0 + b_0}{2}$. In general, when $M_n = \dfrac{a_{n-1} + b_{n-1}}{2}$ with a_{n-1} and b_{n-1} being given, it is defined that

  $$\{a_n, b_n\} = \begin{cases} \{M_n, b_{n-1}\} & \text{if } r(\tau, M_n) > r, \\ \{a_{n-1}, M_n\} & \text{if } r(\tau, M_n) \leq r \end{cases}$$

  and $M_{n+1} = \dfrac{a_n + b_n}{2}$.

Remark 3.3. Let $\tau \in [0, T)$ and $r \in (0, r_T)$ be given. For each $M \geq 0$, we can determine the value $r(\tau, M)$ by solving the two-point boundary value problem (2.8) corresponding to (τ, M), since $r(\tau, M) = \|\varphi^{\tau,M}(T) - z_d\|$ (see Lemma 2.4). Clearly, M_1 is determined by K. Since the map $M \to r(\tau, M)$ is strictly monotonically decreasing and $r(\tau, M)$ tends to 0 as M goes to ∞ (see Lemma 2.6), K can be determined by solving limited number of two-point boundary value problems (2.8) corresponding to (τ, M) with $M = kM_0$, $k = 1, 2, \cdots, K$. On the other hand, when $n \geq 1$ M_{n+1} is determined by $\varphi^{M_n,\tau}$, which can be solved from (2.8) corresponding to (τ, M_n). In summary, we conclude that the sequence $\{M_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ can be solved from a series of two-point boundary value problems (2.8) corresponding to (τ, M), with $M = kM_0$, $k = 1, 2, \cdots, K$ and with $M = M_n$, $n = 1, 2, \cdots$.

Theorem 3.4. *Suppose that $r \in (0, r_T)$ and $\tau \in [0, T)$. Let $\{M_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ be the sequence built up above. Let $u_n = M_n \chi_{(\tau,T)} \dfrac{\chi_\omega \psi^{\tau,M_n}}{\|\chi_\omega \psi^{\tau,M_n}\|}$ and u^* be the optimal control to $(NP)^{r,\tau}$. Then it holds that*

$$M_n \to M(r, \tau) \tag{3.4}$$

and

$$u_n \to u^* \text{ in } L^2(\tau, T; L^2(\Omega)) \text{ and in } C([\tau, T - \delta]; L^2(\Omega)) \text{ for each } \delta \in (0, T - \tau). \tag{3.5}$$

Proof. For simplicity, we write (φ_n, ψ_n) for the solution $(\varphi^{\tau,M_n}, \psi^{\tau,M_n})$ with $n = 1, 2, \cdots$. We start with proving (3.4). From the structure of $\{M_n\}$, it follows that $M_n \in [a_n, b_n] \subset [a_{n-1}, b_{n-1}]$ and $b_n - a_n = \dfrac{b_{n-1} - a_{n-1}}{2}$. Thus, it holds that $\lim_{n\to\infty} a_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} b_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} M_n$. Since the map $M \to r(\tau, M)$ is continuous (see Lemma 2.6) and $r(\tau, a_n) > r \geq r(\tau, b_n)$ (which follows also from the structure of $\{M_n\}$), we find that $r(\tau, \lim_{n\to\infty} M_n) = r$. This, along with (2.11), indicates that

$$r(\tau, \lim_{n\to\infty} M_n) = r(\tau, M(r, \tau)). \tag{3.6}$$

Then, (3.4) follows from (3.6) and the strict monotonicity of the map $M \to r(\tau, M)$ (see Lemma 2.6).

Next, write $y^*(\cdot)$ and $y_n(\cdot)$ for the solutions $y(\cdot; \chi_{(\tau,T)} u^*)$ and $y(\cdot; \chi_{(\tau,T)} u_n)$, respectively. We claim that

$$u_n \to u^* \text{ weakly star in } L^\infty(\tau, T; L^2(\Omega)) \text{ and } y_n \to y^* \text{ in } C([0, T]; L^2(\Omega)). \tag{3.7}$$

In fact, by the definitions of u_n and y_n, it follows from Lemma 2.4 that they are the optimal control and the optimal state to $(OP)^{\tau,M_n}$, respectively. We arbitrarily take subsequences of $\{u_n\}$ and $\{y_n\}$, denoted by $\{u'_{n_k}\}$ and $\{y'_{n_k}\}$, respectively. Clearly, there are subsequences $\{u_{n_k}\}$ of $\{u'_{n_k}\}$ and $\{y_{n_k}\}$ of $\{y'_{n_k}\}$ such that

$$u_{n_k} \to \widetilde{u} \text{ weakly star in } L^\infty(\tau, T; L^2(\Omega)) \text{ and } y_{n_k} \to \widetilde{y} \text{ in } C([0, T]; L^2(\Omega)), \tag{3.8}$$

where $\widetilde{y}(\cdot) = y(\cdot; \chi_{(\tau,T)} \widetilde{u})$. These, along with (3.4) and (3.6), indicate that

$$\|\widetilde{u}\|_{L^\infty(\tau,T;L^2(\Omega))} \leq \varliminf_{k\to\infty} \|u_{n_k}\|_{L^\infty(\tau,T;L^2(\Omega))} = \varliminf_{k\to\infty} M_{n_k} = M(r, \tau)$$

and

$$\|\widetilde{y}(T) - z_d\| = \lim_{k\to\infty} \|y_{n_k}(T) - z_d\| = \lim_{n\to\infty} r(\tau, M_{n_k}) = r(\tau, \lim_{k\to\infty} M_{n_k}) = r(\tau, M(r, \tau)).$$

From these, we see that $\widetilde{u}$ and $\widetilde{y}$ are the optimal control and the optimal state to $(OP)^{\tau,M(r,\tau)}$. Then, according to Theorem 2.1, they are the optimal control and the optimal state to $(NP)^{r,\tau}$. Since the optimal control to $(NP)^{r,\tau}$ is unique, (3.7) follows from (3.8).

Now we verify the first convergence in (3.5). By the first convergence in (3.7), we see that

$$u_n \to u^* \text{ weakly in } L^2(\tau, T; L^2(\Omega)). \tag{3.9}$$

On the other hand, according to Proposition 3.1, it stands that

$$u^*(t) = M(r,\tau)\chi_{(\tau,T)}(t)\frac{\chi_\omega\psi^{\tau,M(r,\tau)}(t)}{\|\chi_\omega\psi^{\tau,M(r,\tau)}(t)\|},\ \ t\in[0,T) \tag{3.10}$$

$$y^* = \varphi^{\tau,M(r,\tau)}\ \text{ and }\ \|y^*(T)-z_d\| = r. \tag{3.11}$$

By the definition of u_n, (3.10) and (3.4), we see that

$$\|u_n\|_{L^2(\tau,T;L^2(\Omega))} \to \|u^*\|_{L^2(\tau,T;L^2(\Omega))}.$$

This, along with (3.9), yields the first convergence in (3.5).

Finally, we show the second convergence in (3.5). By the first equality of (3.11) and the second convergence in (3.8), we see that $y_n(T)\to\varphi^{\tau,M(r,\tau)}(T)$ strongly in $L^2(\Omega)$. This, together with the equations satisfied by ψ_n and $\psi^{\tau,M(r,\tau)}$, respectively, indicates that

$$\psi_n \to \psi^{\tau,M(r,\tau)}\ \text{ in }\ C([0,T];L^2(\Omega)). \tag{3.12}$$

Then we arbitrarily fix a $\delta\in(0,T-\tau)$. By (3.10) and by the definition of u_n, after some simple computation, we deduce that for each $t\in[0,T-\delta]$,

$$\|u_n(t)-u^*(t)\| \ \le |M_n - M(r,\tau)| + \frac{2M_n}{\|\chi_\omega\psi^{\tau,M(r,\tau)}(t)\|}\|\chi_\omega\psi_n(t)-\chi_\omega\psi^{\tau,M(r,\tau)}(t)\|. \tag{3.13}$$

On the other hand, by the second equality of (3.11) and the unique continuation property (see [8]), it follows that $\|\chi_\omega\psi^{\tau,M(r,\tau)}(t)\|\neq 0$ for all $t\in[0,T)$. This, together with the continuity of $\psi^{\tau,M(r,\tau)}(\cdot)$ over $[0,T-\delta]$, yields that

$$\max_{t\in[0,T-\delta]}\frac{1}{\|\chi_\omega\psi^{\tau,M(r,\tau)}(t)\|}\le C_\delta\ \text{ for some positive }\ C_\delta. \tag{3.14}$$

Now, the second convergence in (3.5) follows immediately from (3.13), (3.4), (3.12), and (3.14). This completes the proof.

□

We end this section by introducing an algorithm for the optimal time and the optimal control to $(TP)^{M,r}$. For each pair (M,r) with $r\in(0,r_T)$ and $M\ge M(r,0)$, we construct a sequence $\{\tau_n\}_{n=0}^\infty\subset[0,T)$ as follows.

- **Structure of $\{\tau_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$:** Let $a_0=0$ and $b_0=T$. Set $\tau_1=\dfrac{a_0+b_0}{2}$. In general, when $\tau_n=\dfrac{a_{n-1}+b_{n-1}}{2}$ with a_{n-1} and b_{n-1} being given, it is defined that

  $$\{a_n,b_n\}=\begin{cases}\{a_{n-1},\tau_n\} & \text{if } r(\tau_n,M)>r,\\ \{\tau_n,b_{n-1}\} & \text{if } r(\tau_n,M)\le r\end{cases}$$

  and $\tau_{n+1}=\dfrac{a_n+b_n}{2}$.

Remark 3.5. Since $r(\tau_n, M) = \|\varphi^{\tau_n,M}(T) - z_d\|$, τ_{n+1} is determined by $\varphi^{\tau_n,M}$, which can be solved from (2.8) corresponding to $\tau = \tau_n$.

By Theorem 2.1, Lemma 2.4, Lemma 2.11 and Proposition 3.2, following a very similar argument to prove Theorem 3.4, we can verify the next approximation result.

Theorem 3.6. *Suppose that* $r \in (0, r_T)$ *and* $M \geq M(r, 0)$*. Let* $\{\tau_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ *be the sequence built up above. Let* $u_n = M\chi_{(\tau_n,T)}\dfrac{\chi_\omega\psi^{\tau_n,M}}{\|\chi_\omega\psi^{\tau_n,M}\|}$ *and* u^* *be the optimal control to* $(TP)^{M,r}$*. Then it holds that*

$$\tau_n \to \tau(M, r) \ \ \text{as} \ \ n \to \infty$$

and

$$u_n \to u^* \ \ \text{in} \ \ L^2(\tau(M, r), T; L^2(\Omega)) \ \ \text{and in} \ \ C([\tau(M, r), T - \delta]; L^2(\Omega))$$

for each $\delta \in (0, T - \tau(M, r))$*.*

Remark 3.7. (i) From the above-mentioned two algorithms, we observe that the optimal norm and the optimal control to $(NP)^{r,\tau}$ and the optimal time and the optimal control to $(TP)^{M,r}$ can be numerically solved, through numerically solving the two-point boundary value problems (2.8) with parameters M and τ suitably chosen.
(ii) All results obtained in this section hold for the case where the controlled system is Equation (1.5) (see Remark 2.13).

4 Application II: Optimal Normal Feedback Law

Throughout this section, we arbitrarily fix a $r > 0$. We aim to build up a feedback law for norm optimal control problems.

4.1 Main results

We first introduce the following controlled equation:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t y - \triangle y = \chi_\omega u & \text{in } \Omega \times (t_0, T), \\ y = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \times (t_0, T), \\ y(t_0) = y_0, & \text{in } \Omega \times (t_0, T). \end{cases} \tag{4.1}$$

where $(t_0, y_0) \in [0, T) \times L^2(\Omega)$. Denote by $y(\cdot; u, t_0, y_0)$ the solution to Equation (4.1) corresponding to the control u and the initial data (t_0, y_0). Then, we define the following optimal target control and optimal norm control problems.

- $(OP)^M_{t_0,y_0}$: $\inf\{\|y(T;u,t_0,y_0)-z_d\|^2 : u\in L^\infty(t_0,T;B(0,M))\}$;
- $(NP)_{t_0,y_0}$: $\inf\{\|u\|_{L^\infty(t_0,T;L^2(\Omega))} : u\in L^\infty(t_0,T;L^2(\Omega)), y(T;u,t_0,y_0)\in B(z_d,r)\}$.

Throughout this section,

- $\bar{u}^M_{t_0,y_0}$ stands for the optimal control to $(OP)^M_{t_0,y_0}$;
- $N(t_0,y_0)$ denotes the optimal norm to $(NP)_{t_0,y_0}$.

Thus $N(\cdot,\cdot)$ defines an optimal norm functional over $[0,T)\times L^2(\Omega)$.

The only difference between optimal target control problems $(OP)^{0,M}$ (which was introduced in Section 1) and $(OP)^M_{t_0,y_0}$ is that the initial data for the first one is $(0,y_0)$ while the initial data for the second one is (t_0,y_0). The same can be said about the norm optimal control problems. Therefore, corresponding to each result about $(OP)^{0,M}$ or $(NP)^{r,0}$, obtained in Section 2 or Section 3, there is an analogous version for $(OP)^M_{t_0,y_0}$ or $(NP)_{t_0,y_0}$.

A feedback law for the norm optimal control problems will be established, with the aid of the equivalence between norm and target optimal controls and some properties of $(OP)^M_{t_0,y_0}$. Those properties are related to the following two-point boundary value problem associated with $M\geq 0$, $t_0\in[0,T)$ and $y_0\in L^2(\Omega)$:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t y-\Delta y = M\dfrac{\chi_\omega\psi}{\|\chi_\omega\psi\|}, & \partial_t\psi+\triangle\psi=0 \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega\times(t_0,T), \\ y=0, & \psi=0 \quad \text{on} \quad \partial\Omega\times(t_0,T), \\ y(t_0)=y_0, & \psi(T)=-(y(T)-z_d) \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega. \end{cases} \tag{4.2}$$

Similar to Lemma 2.5, for each triplet $(M,t_0,y_0)\in[0,\infty)\times[0,T)\times L^2(\Omega)$, Equation (4.2) has a unique solution in $C([0,T];L^2(\Omega))$. Throughout this section,

- $(\bar{y}^M_{t_0,y_0},\bar{\psi}^M_{t_0,y_0})$ denotes the solution of (4.2) corresponding to M, t_0 and y_0;
- $\bar{y}^M_{t_0,y_0}$ and $\bar{\psi}^M_{t_0,y_0}$ denote the first and the second component of the above solution, respectively, when one of them appears alone.

Because of the assumption (1.2), $\bar{\psi}^{N(t_0,y_0)}_{t_0,y_0}(T)=-(\bar{y}^{N(t_0,y_0)}_{t_0,y_0}(T)-z_d)\neq 0$ (see the proof of Lemma 2.2). Thus, it follows from the unique continuation property of the heat equation (see [8]) that

$$\chi_\omega\bar{\psi}^{M(t_0,y_0)}_{t_0,y_0}(t_0)\neq 0 \ \text{ for all } \ (t_0,y_0)\in[0,T)\times L^2(\Omega). \tag{4.3}$$

Now we define a feedback law $F:[0,T)\times L^2(\Omega)\mapsto L^2(\Omega)$ by setting

$$F(t_0,y_0)=N(t_0,y_0)\frac{\chi_\omega\bar{\psi}^{N(t_0,y_0)}_{t_0,y_0}(t_0)}{\|\chi_\omega\bar{\psi}^{N(t_0,y_0)}_{t_0,y_0}(t_0)\|},\ (t_0,y_0)\in[0,T)\times L^2(\Omega). \tag{4.4}$$

Because of the existence and uniqueness of the solution to (4.2), as well as (4.3), the map F is well defined. For each $(t_0,y_0)\in[0,T)\times L^2(\Omega)$, consider the evolution equation:

$$\begin{cases}\dot{y}(t)-Ay(t)=\chi_\omega F(t,y(t)), & t\in(t_0,T),\\ y(t_0)=y_0,\end{cases} \tag{4.5}$$

where the operator A was defined in Section 1. Two main results in this section are as follows:

Theorem 4.1. *For each pair $(t_0,y_0)\in[0,T)\times L^2(\Omega)$, Equation (4.5) has a unique (mild) solution. Furthermore, this solution is exactly $\bar{y}^{N(t_0,y_0)}_{t_0,y_0}(\cdot)$.*

Theorem 4.2. *For each pair $(t_0,y_0)\in[0,T)\times L^2(\Omega)$, $F(\cdot,y_F(\cdot;t_0,y_0))$ is the optimal control to $(NP)_{t_0,y_0}$, where $y_F(\cdot;t_0,y_0))$ is the unique solution to Equation (4.5) corresponding to the initial data (t_0,y_0).*

It follows directly from Theorem 4.1 that for each $y_0\in L^2(\Omega)$ and each $\tau\in[0,T)$, the evolution equation

$$\begin{cases}\dot{y}(t)-Ay(t)=\chi_\omega\chi_{(\tau,T)}F(t,y(t)), & t\in(0,T),\\ y(0)=y_0\end{cases} \tag{4.6}$$

admits a unique (mild) solution, denoted by $y_{F,\tau,y_0}(\cdot)$. Thus, the following result is a direct consequence of Theorem 4.2:

Corollary 4.3. *For each $y_0\in L^2(\Omega)$ and each $\tau\in[0,T)$, $\chi_{(\tau,T)}(\cdot)F(\cdot,y_{F,\tau,y_0}(\cdot))$ is the optimal control to Problem $(NP)^{r,\tau}$ with the initial state y_0.*

4.2 Proof of Theorem 4.1 (Part 1): The existence of solutions

By a very similar argument to prove Lemma 2.4, we can obtain that

$$\bar{u}^M_{t_0,y_0}(t)=M\frac{\chi_\omega\bar{\psi}^M_{t_0,y_0}(t)}{||\chi_\omega\bar{\psi}^M_{t_0,y_0}(t)||},\ t\in[t_0,T). \tag{4.7}$$

By the uniqueness and existence of the solution to (4.2), we can easily derive the following consequence, which, in some sense, is a dynamic programming principle.

Lemma 4.4. *Let* $(t_0, y_0) \in [0, T) \times L^2(\Omega)$ *and* $M \geq 0$. *Then, for each* $s \in (t_0, T)$,

$$(\bar{y}^M_{t_0,y_0}, \bar{\psi}^M_{t_0,y_0})\Big|_{[s,T]} = \big(\bar{y}^M_{s,\bar{y}^M_{t_0,y_0}(s)}, \bar{\psi}^M_{s,\bar{y}^M_{t_0,y_0}(s)}\big). \tag{4.8}$$

Lemma 4.5. *Let* $(t_0, y_0) \in [0, T) \times L^2(\Omega)$. *Then*

$$M = N(t_0, y_0) \text{ if and only if } \left\|\bar{y}^M_{t_0,y_0}(T) - z_d\right\| = r \wedge \left\|e^{(T-t_0)\Delta} y_0 - z_d\right\|, \tag{4.9}$$

where "$\wedge$*" is the symbol taking the smaller. Moreover, the control, defined by*

$$\bar{u}^{N(t_0,y_0)}_{t_0,y_0}(t) = N(t_0, y_0)\frac{\chi_\omega \psi^{N(t_0,y_0)}_{t_0,y_0}(t)}{||\chi_\omega \psi^{N(t_0,y_0)}_{t_0,y_0}(t)||},\ t \in (t_0, T), \tag{4.10}$$

is the unique optimal control of Problem $(NP)_{t_0,y_0}$.

Proof. First, we show (4.9) for the case where $\|e^{(T-t_0)\Delta} y_0 - z_d\| > r$. In this case, we can apply the analogous version of Proposition 3.1 for Problem $(NP)_{t_0,y_0}$ to get that $M = N(t_0, y_0)$ if and only if $\|\bar{y}^M_{t_0,y_0}(T) - z_d\| = r$. This leads to (4.9) for this case.

Next, we prove (4.9) for the case where $\|e^{(T-t_0)\Delta} y_0 - z_d\| \leq r$. In this case, one can easily check that $N(t_0, y_0) = 0$, the null control is the optimal control to $(OP)^0_{t_0,y_0}$, and $\bar{y}^0_{t_0,y_0}(\cdot) = y(\cdot; 0, t_0, y_0) = e^{(\cdot-t_0)\Delta} y_0$ over $[t_0, T]$. Suppose that $M = N(t_0, y_0)$. Then it holds that $M = 0$ and $\|\bar{y}^0_{t_0,y_0}(T) - z_d\| = \|e^{(T-t_0)\Delta} y_0 - z_d\|$. These lead to the statement on the right hand side of (4.9). Conversely, suppose that there is an $M_0 \geq 0$ such that

$$\|\bar{y}^{M_0}_{t_0,y_0}(T) - z_d\| = \|e^{(T-t_0)\Delta} y_0 - z_d\|. \tag{4.11}$$

To show the statement on the left side of (4.9), it suffices to prove that $M_0 = 0$. By the analogous version of Lemma 2.4 for $(OP)^{M_0}_{t_0,y_0}$ (see (2.10)), it holds that

$$\|\bar{y}^{M_0}_{t_0,y_0}(T) - z_d\| = r_{t_0,y_0}(M_0), \tag{4.12}$$

where $r_{t_0,y_0}(\cdot)$ corresponds to the map $M \to r(0, M)$ given in Section 1, namely,

$$r_{t_0,y_0}(M) = \inf\{\|y(T; u, t_0, y_0) - z_d\| : u \in B(0, M))\},\ M \geq 0.$$

Since the null control is the optimal control to $(OP)^0_{t_0,y_0}$, we find that

$$r_{t_0,y_0}(0) = \|y(T; 0, t_0, y_0) - z_d\| = \|e^{(T-t_0)\Delta} y_0 - z_d\|.$$

Along with (4.11) and (4.12), this indicates that

$$r_{t_0,y_0}(0) = r_{t_0,y_0}(M_0). \tag{4.13}$$

By the analogous version of Lemma 2.6 for $(OP)^M_{t_0,y_0}$, the map $M \to r_{t_0,y_0}(M)$ is strictly monotonically decreasing. This, together with (4.13), yields that $M_0 = 0$.

In summary, we conclude that (4.9) stands.

Finally, we prove (4.10). In the case that $\|e^{(T-t_0)}\Delta y_0 - z_d\| > r$, according to the analogous version of Proposition 3.1 for Problem $(NP)_{t_0,y_0}$, the control defined by (4.10) is the unique optimal control of Problem $(NP)_{t_0,y_0}$. In the case where $\|e^{(T-t_0)}\Delta y_0 - z_d\| \leq r$, it is clear that $N(t_0, y_0) = 0$ and the null control is the optimal control to $(NP)_{t_0,y_0}$. Hence, (4.10) holds for this case. This completes the proof.

□

The following result shows that the functional $N(\cdot,\cdot)$ holds the dynamic programming principle.

Lemma 4.6. *Let* $(t_0, y_0) \in [0, T) \times L^2(\Omega)$. *Then it stands that*

$$N(t_0, y_0) = N\left(s,\ \bar{y}^{N(t_0,y_0)}_{t_0,y_0}(s)\right) \text{ for each } s \in (t_0, T). \tag{4.14}$$

Proof. In the case where $e^{(T-t_0)\triangle} y_0 \in B(z_d, r)$, it is clear that

$$N(t_0, y_0) = 0 \ \text{ and } \ \bar{y}^{N(t_0,y_0)}_{t_0,y_0}(\cdot) = e^{(\cdot - t_0)\triangle} y_0.$$

Because

$$e^{(T-s)\triangle} \bar{y}^{N(t_0,y_0)}_{t_0,y_0}(s) = e^{(T-s)\triangle} e^{(s-t_0)\triangle} y_0 = e^{(T-t_0)\triangle} y_0 \in B(z_d, r) \ \text{ for each } \ s \in (t_0, T),$$

we see that $N\big(s,\ \bar{y}^{N(t_0,y_0)}_{t_0,y_0}(s)\big) = 0$. Therefore the equality (4.14) holds for this case.

In the case where $e^{(T-t_0)\triangle} y_0 \notin B(z_d, r)$, it is clear that $r \wedge \left\|e^{(T-t_0)\triangle} y_0 - z_d\right\| = r$. By the analogous version of Proposition 3.1 for Problem $(NP)_{t_0,y_0}$, it holds that $\|\bar{y}^{N(t_0,y_0)}_{t_0,y_0}(T) - z_d\| = r$. Thus, it follows from (4.9) that

$$\bar{y}^{N(t_0,y_0)}_{t_0,y_0}(T) \in \partial B(z_d, r). \tag{4.15}$$

We claim that

$$e^{(T-s)\triangle} \bar{y}^{N(t_0,y_0)}_{t_0,y_0}(s) \notin B(z_d, r) \ \text{ for all } \ s \in (t_0, T). \tag{4.16}$$

If (4.16) did not hold, then there would exist a $\hat{s} \in (t_0, T)$ such that

$$e^{(T-\hat{s})\triangle} \bar{y}^{N(t_0,y_0)}_{t_0,y_0}(\hat{s}) \notin B(z_d, r). \tag{4.17}$$

We construct a control $\hat{u}$ by setting

$$\hat{u}(s) = \chi_{(t_0,\hat{s})}(s) N(t_0, y_0) \frac{\chi_\omega \bar{\psi}^{N(t_0,y_0)}_{t_0,y_0}(s)}{\|\chi_\omega \bar{\psi}^{N(t_0,y_0)}_{t_0,y_0}(s)\|}, \quad s \in [t_0, T). \tag{4.18}$$

Clearly, the solution $y(\cdot;\hat{u},t_0,y_0)$ to (4.1), where $u=\hat{u}$, coincides with $\bar{y}^{N(t_0,y_0)}_{t_0,y_0}(\cdot)$ over $[t_0,\hat{s}]$. This, along with (4.18) and (4.17), indicates that

$$y(T;\hat{u},t_0,y_0)=e^{(T-\hat{s})\triangle}y(\hat{s};\hat{u},t_0,y_0)\in B(z_d,r). \tag{4.19}$$

On the other hand, it follows from (4.18) that $\|\hat{u}||_{L^\infty(t_0,T;L^2(\Omega))}=N(t_0,y_0)$. This, together with (4.19), yields that $\hat{u}$ is the optimal control to $(NP)_{t_0,y_0}$. However, the problem $(NP)_{t_0,y_0}$ holds the bang-bang property (it follows from the analogous version of Proposition 2.7 for $(NP)_{t_0,y_0}$). This implies that $\|\hat{u}(s)\|=N(t_0,y_0)$ for a.e. $s\in(t_0,T)$, which contradicts to the structure of $\hat{u}$. Hence, (4.16) stands.

Next, by (4.8) and (4.15), we see that

$$\bar{y}^{N(t_0,y_0)}_{s,\bar{y}^{N(t_0,y_0)}_{t_0,y_0}(s)}(T)=\bar{y}^{N(t_0,y_0)}_{t_0,y_0}(T)\in\partial B(z_d,r)\text{ for each }s\in(t_0,T).$$

This, together with (4.16), implies that

$$\|\bar{y}^{N(t_0,y_0)}_{s,\bar{y}^{N(t_0,y_0)}_{t_0,y_0}(s)}(T)-z_d\|=r\wedge\|e^{(T-s)\triangle}\bar{y}^{N(t_0,y_0)}_{t_0,y_0}(s)-z_d\|\text{ for each }s\in(t_0,T). \tag{4.20}$$

Now, we arbitrarily fix a $s\in(t_0,T)$. By (4.20), we can apply (4.9), with $t_0=s$ and $y_0=\bar{y}^{N(t_0,y_0)}_{t_0,y_0}(s)$, to get that

$$N(t_0,y_0)=N(s,\bar{y}^{N(t_0,y_0)}_{t_0,y_0}(s)),$$

which gives the equality (4.14) for the second case. In summary, we finish the proof. □

Proof of Theorem 4.1 (Part 1): The existence. It follows from (4.4) (the definition of F) that

$$F(t,\ \bar{y}^{N(t_0,y_0)}_{t_0,y_0}(t))=N(t,\ \bar{y}^{N(t_0,y_0)}_{t_0,y_0}(t))\frac{\phi(t)}{\|\phi(t\|},\ t\in(t_0,T),$$

where $\phi(t)=\chi_\omega\bar{\psi}^{N(t,\ \bar{y}^{N(t_0,y_0)}_{t_0,y_0}(t))}_{t,\ \bar{y}^{N(t_0,y_0)}_{t_0,y_0}(t)}(t)$. This, together with (4.14) and (4.8), yields that

$$F(t,\ \bar{y}^{N(t_0,y_0)}_{t_0,y_0}(t))=N(t_0,y_0)\frac{\chi_\omega\bar{\psi}^{N(t_0,y_0)}_{t_0,y_0}(t)}{\|\chi_\omega\bar{\psi}^{N(t_0,y_0)}_{t_0,y_0}(t)\|}=\frac{d}{dt}\bar{y}^{N(t_0,y_0)}_{t_0,y_0}(t)+A\bar{y}^{N(t_0,y_0)}_{t_0,y_0}(t),\ t\in(t_0,T).$$

Here, we used that $\chi_\omega\circ\chi_\omega=\chi_\omega$. From the above equality and the fact that $\bar{y}^{N(t_0,y_0)}_{t_0,y_0}(t_0)=y_0$, it follows that $\bar{y}^{N(t_0,y_0)}_{t_0,y_0}(\cdot)$ is a solution to (4.5). This completes the proof. □

4.3 Proof of Theorem 4.1 (Part 2): The uniqueness

The key to prove the uniqueness is showing the following properties of the feedback law $F(\cdot,\cdot)$.

Proposition 4.7. *(i) For each pair* $(\bar{t}_0, \bar{y}_0) \in [0,T) \times L^2(\Omega)$, *there is a* $\bar{\rho} > 0$ *such that* $F(t_0, \cdot)$ *is Lipschitz continuous in* $B(\bar{y}_0, \bar{\rho})$ *uniformly with respect to* $t_0 \in [(\bar{t}_0 - \bar{\rho})^+, \bar{t}_0 + \bar{\rho}]$. *(ii) For each* $\bar{y}_0 \in L^2(\Omega)$, $F(\cdot\,, \bar{y}_0)$ *is continuous over* $[0,T)$.

When it is proved, **the uniqueness of the solution to Equation (4.5) follows immediately from the generalized Picard-Lindelof Theorem (see [15]) and Proposition 4.7. Consequently, the proof of Theorem 4.1 is completed.**

The remainder is showing Proposition 4.7. To serve such purpose, we first study some continuity properties of $N(\cdot,\cdot)$. These properties will be concluded in Lemma 4.10. Two lemmas before it will play important roles in its proof.

Lemma 4.8. *For each* $t_0 \in [0,T)$, *the functional* $N(t_0, \cdot)$ *is convex over* $L^2(\Omega)$.

Proof. Let y_0^1 and y_0^2 belong to $L^2(\Omega)$. The optimal controls $\bar{u}^i$ to $(NP)_{t_0, y_0^i}$, $i = 1,2$, satisfy that $N(t_0, y_0^i) = \|\bar{u}^i\|_{L^\infty(t_0,T;L^2(\Omega))}$ and $y(T; \bar{u}^i, t_0, y_0^i) \in B(z_d, r)$, $i = 1,2$. Since for each $\lambda \in (0,1)$,

$$y(T; \lambda\bar{u}^1 + (1-\lambda)\bar{u}^2, t_0, \lambda y_0^1 + (1-\lambda)y_0^2) = \lambda y(T; \bar{u}^1, t_0, y_0^1) + (1-\lambda) y(T; \bar{u}^2, t_0, y_0^2) \in B(z_d, r),$$

we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} &N(t_0, \lambda y_0^1 + (1-\lambda)y_0^2) \le \|\lambda\bar{u}^1 + (1-\lambda)\bar{u}^2\|_{L^\infty(t_0,T;L^2(\Omega))} \\ &\le \lambda\|\bar{u}^1\|_{L^\infty(t_0,T;L^2(\Omega))} + (1-\lambda)\|\bar{u}^2\|_{L^\infty(t_0,T;L^2(\Omega))} \\ &= \lambda N(t_0, y_0^1) + (1-\lambda) N(t_0, y_0^2). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. □

Lemma 4.9. *For each* $\bar{t}_0 \in [0,T)$ *and each bounded subset* E *of* $L^2(\Omega)$, *the functional* $N(\cdot,\cdot)$ *is bounded on* $\Big[(\bar{t}_0 - \bar{\delta})^+, \bar{t}_0 + \bar{\delta}\Big] \times E$, *where* $\bar{\delta} = (T - \bar{t}_0)/2$.

Proof. Write $C_E = \sup\{\|y_0\| : y_0 \in E\}$. Let $(t_0, y_0) \in \Big[(\bar{t}_0 - \bar{\delta})^+, \bar{t}_0 + \bar{\delta}\Big] \times E$. By the null controllability of the heat equation over $(t_0, \bar{t}_0 + 3\bar{\delta}/2)$ (see, for instance, [6]), there is a control u_1 with

$$\|u_1\|_{L^\infty(t_0, \bar{t}_0 + 3\bar{\delta}/2; L^2(\Omega))} \le C_1 \|y_0\| \le C_1 C_E, \tag{4.21}$$

where $C_1 > 0$ is independent of t_0 and y_0, such that

$$\bar{y} \equiv y(\bar{t}_0 + 3\bar{\delta}/2; u_1, t_0, y_0) = 0.$$

Here we used that $t_0 \leq \bar{t}_0 + \bar{\delta}$. Then, by the approximate controllability of the heat equation over $(\bar{t}_0 + 3\bar{\delta}/2, T)$ (see, for instance, [4]), there is another control u_2 with

$$\|u_2\|_{L^\infty(\bar{t}_0+3\bar{\delta}/2,T;L^2(\Omega))} \leq C_2,$$

where $C_2 > 0$ is independent of t_0 and y_0, such that

$$y(T; u_2, \bar{t}_0 + 3\bar{\delta}/2, \bar{y}) \in B(z_d, r).$$

Clearly, the control $v \equiv \chi_{(t_0,\bar{t}_0+3\bar{\delta}/2)}u_1+\chi_{(\bar{t}_0+3\bar{\delta}/2,T)}u_2$ satisfies that $y(T; v, t_0, y_0) \in B(z_d, r)$. Therefore, it holds that

$$N(t_0, y_0) \leq \|v\|_{L^\infty(t_0,T;L^2(\Omega))} \leq \max\{C_1 C_E, C_2\}.$$

This completes the proof. □

Lemma 4.10. *(i) For each $(\bar{t}_0, \bar{y}_0) \in [0, T) \times L^2(\Omega)$ and each $\rho \in (0, 1/2)$, $N(t_0, \cdot)$ is Lipschitz continuous over $B(\bar{y}_0, \rho)$ uniformly w.r.t. $t_0 \in \Big[(\bar{t}_0 - \bar{\delta})^+, \bar{t}_0 + \bar{\delta}\Big]$, where $\bar{\delta} = (T - \bar{t}_0)/2$; (ii) For each $\bar{y}_0 \in L^2(\Omega)$, $N(\cdot, \bar{y}_0)$ is continuous over $[0, T)$.*

Proof. (i) Let $(\bar{t}_0, y_0) \in [0, T) \times L^2(\Omega)$ and let $\rho \in (0, 1/2)$. We arbitrarily take two different points y_0^1 and y_0^2 from $B(\bar{y}_0, \rho) \subset B(\bar{y}_0, 1)$. Denote by $\mathcal{L}$ the straight line passing through y_0^1 and y_0^2, namely, $\mathcal{L} \equiv \Big\{ y_0^\lambda \overset{\Delta}{=} (1 - \lambda)y_0^1 + \lambda y_0^2 \;\Big|\; \lambda \in (-\infty, +\infty) \Big\}$. Clearly, $\mathcal{L}$ intersects with $B(\bar{y}_0, 1)$ at two different points, denoted by $y_0^{\lambda_1}$ and $y_0^{\lambda_2}$, with $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2$. Since the segment $\{ y_0^\lambda | \lambda \in [0, 1] \} \subseteq B(\bar{y}_0, \rho)$ and $B(\bar{y}, \rho) \bigcap \partial B(\bar{y}, 1) = \emptyset$, it holds that $\lambda_1 < 0 < 1 < \lambda_2$. Moreover, one can easily check that

$$\frac{\|y_0^1 - y_0^{\lambda_1}\|}{0 - \lambda_1} = \frac{\|y_0^2 - y_0^1\|}{1 - 0} = \frac{\|y_0^{\lambda_2} - y_0^2\|}{\lambda_2 - 1}. \tag{4.22}$$

For each $t_0 \in \Big[(\bar{t}_0 - \bar{\delta})^+, \bar{t}_0 + \bar{\delta}\Big]$, we define a function $g_{t_0}(\cdot; y_0^1, y_0^2)$ by setting

$$g_{t_0}(\lambda; y_0^1, y_0^2) = N(t_0, (1 - \lambda)y_0^1 + \lambda y_0^2), \qquad \lambda \in (-\infty, +\infty).$$

Obviously, the convexity of $N(t_0, \cdot)$ (see Lemma 4.8) implies the convexity of $g_{t_0}(\cdot; y_0^1, y_0^2)$. By the property of convex functions, one has that

$$\frac{g_{t_0}(0; y_0^1, y_0^2) - g_{t_0}(\lambda_1; y_0^1, y_0^2)}{0 - \lambda_1} \leq \frac{g_{t_0}(1; y_0^1, y_0^2) - g_{t_0}(0; y_0^1, y_0^2)}{1 - 0} \leq \frac{g_{t_0}(\lambda_2; y_0^1, y_0^2) - g_{t_0}(1; y_0^1, y_0^2)}{\lambda_2 - 1}.$$

This, along with (4.22) and the nonnegativity of $g_{t_0}(1; y_0^1, y_0^2)$, indicates that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{N(t_0, y_0^2) - N(t_0, y_0^1)}{\|y_0^2 - y_0^1\|} = \frac{g_{t_0}(1; y_0^1, y_0^2) - g_{t_0}(0; y_0^1, y_0^2)}{\|y_0^2 - y_0^1\|} \\
&\le \frac{g_{t_0}(\lambda_2; y_0^1, y_0^2) - g_{t_0}(1; y_0^1, y_0^2)}{(\lambda_2 - 1)\|y_0^2 - y_0^1\|} \le \frac{g_{t_0}(\lambda_2; y_0^1, y_0^2)}{(\lambda_2 - 1)\|y_0^2 - y_0^1\|} \\
&= \frac{g_{t_0}(\lambda_2; y_0^1, y_0^2)}{\|y_0^{\lambda_2} - y_0^2\|}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.23}$$

Two observations are as follows. The triangle inequality implies that

$$\|y_0^{\lambda_2} - y_0^2\| \ge \|y_0^{\lambda_2} - \bar{y}_0\| - \|y_0^2 - \bar{y}_0\| \ge 1 - \rho;$$

The boundedness of $N(\cdot, \cdot)$ (*see* Lemma 4.9) gives that for each $t_0 \in \Big[(\bar{t}_0 - \bar{\delta})^+, \bar{t}_0 + \bar{\delta}\Big]$, $y_0^1, y_0^2 \in B(\bar{y}_0, \rho)$,

$$g_{t_0}(\lambda_2; y_0^1, y_0^2) = N(t_0, y_0^{\lambda_2}) \le \sup\Big\{ N(s_0, z_0) \ \Big| \ (s_0, z_0) \in \Big[(\bar{t}_0 - \bar{\delta})^+, \bar{t}_0 + \bar{\delta}\Big] \times B(\bar{y}_0, 1) \Big\} \equiv C.$$

Along with these two observations, (4.23) yields that

$$N(t_0, y_0^1) - N(t_0, y_0^2) \le \frac{C}{1 - \rho}\|y_0^2 - y_0^1\| \equiv C(\rho)\|y_0^2 - y_0^1\|.$$

Similarly, we can obtain $N(t_0, y_0^2) - N(t_0, y_0^1) \le C(\rho)\|y_0^2 - y_0^1\|$. These lead to the desired Lipschitz continuity.

(*ii*) Let $\bar{y}_0 \in L^2(\Omega)$. Arbitrarily take $\bar{t}_0$ from $[0, T)$ and write $\bar{\delta} = (T - \bar{t}_0)/2$. It suffices to show that $N(\cdot, \bar{y}_0)$ is continuous over $\Big[(\bar{t}_0 - \bar{\delta})^+, \bar{t}_0 + \bar{\delta}\Big]$. For this purpose, we arbitrarily take two different t_0^1 and t_0^2 from this interval. Without lose of generality, we can assume that $t_0^1 < t_0^2$. Then by (4.14) (see Lemma 4.6), the part (*i*) of the current lemma and Lemma 4.9, we can easily deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
&|N(t_0^1, \bar{y}_0) - N(t_0^2, \bar{y}_0)| \\
&= \Big| N\Big(t_0^2, \ \bar{y}_{t_0^1, \bar{y}_0}^{N(t_0^1, \bar{y}_0)}(t_0^2)\Big) - N(t_0^2, \bar{y}_0) \Big| \le C \left\| \bar{y}_{t_0^1, \bar{y}_0}^{N(t_0^1, \bar{y}_0)}(t_0^2) - \bar{y}_0) \right\| \\
&= C \left\| \Big[e^{(t_0^2 - t_0^1)\triangle} - I \Big] \bar{y}_0 + \int_{t_0^1}^{t_0^2} e^{(t_0^2 - s)\triangle} \bar{u}_{t_0^1, \bar{y}_0}^{N(t_0^1, \bar{y}_0)}(s) ds \right\| \\
&\le C \left\| e^{(t_0^2 - t_0^1)\triangle} - I \right\| \|\bar{y}_0\| + C|t_0^2 - t_0^1|
\end{aligned}$$

where C stands for a positive constant independent of t_0^1 and t_0^2. It varies in different contexts. Clearly, the continuity of $N(\cdot,\bar{y}_0)$ over $\Big[(\bar{t}_0-\bar{\delta})^+,\bar{t}_0+\bar{\delta}\Big]$ follows from the above inequality at once.

In summary, we finish the proof. $\square$

Next, we study some properties for the map $\mathcal{N}:[0,T)\times L^2(\Omega)\times[0,+\infty)\mapsto L^2(\Omega)$ defined by

$$\mathcal{N}(t_0,y_0,M)=\bar{u}^M_{t_0,y_0}(t_0)=M\frac{\chi_\omega\bar{\psi}^M_{t_0,y_0}(t_0)}{\|\chi_\omega\bar{\psi}^M_{t_0,y_0}(t_0)\|}. \tag{4.24}$$

Lemma 4.11. *(i) For each $(\bar{t}_0,\bar{y}_0,\bar{M})\in[0,T)\times L^2(\Omega)\times[0,\infty)$, there is a $\bar{\rho}>0$ such that $\mathcal{N}(t_0,\cdot,\cdot)$ is Lipschitz continuous over $B(\bar{y}_0,\bar{\rho})\times[(\bar{M}-\bar{\rho})^+,\bar{M}+\bar{\rho}]$ uniformly with respect to $t_0\in B(\bar{t}_0,\bar{\rho})\bigcap[0,T)$. (ii) $\mathcal{N}(\cdot,\bar{y}_0,\cdot)$ is continuous over $[0,T)\times[0,\infty)$.*

Proof. (i) Let $(\bar{t}_0,\bar{y}_0,\bar{M})\in[0,T)\times L^2(\Omega)\times[0,\infty)$. The proof of the first continuity will be carried by several steps as follows:

Step 1. For all $t_0\in[0,T)$, $0\le M_1\le M_2$ and $y_0^1,\ y_0^2\in L^2(\Omega)$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\mathcal{N}(t_0,y_0^1,M_1)-\mathcal{N}(t_0,y_0^2,M_2)\|\le|M_1-M_2|+\\&\frac{4M_1}{\|\chi_\omega\bar{\psi}^{M_1}_{t_0,y_0^1}\|}\left[M_1\|y_0^1-y_0^2\|+(\|y_0^2\|+\|z_d\|)|M_1-M_2|\right]\quad\text{when } M_1>0;\end{aligned} \tag{4.25}$$

$$\|\mathcal{N}(t_0,y_0^1,M_1)-\mathcal{N}(t_0,y_0^2,M_2)\|=|M_1-M_2|\quad\text{when } M_1=0, \tag{4.26}$$

The equality (4.26) follows directly from the definition of $\mathcal{N}$. Now we prove (4.25). For simplification of notation, we write

$$\bar{y}^i\triangleq\bar{y}^{M_i}_{t_0,y_0^i},\quad\bar{\psi}^i\triangleq\bar{\psi}^{M_i}_{t_0,y_0^i},\quad\bar{u}^i\triangleq\bar{u}^{M_i}_{t_0,y_0^i},\qquad i=1,2.$$

It is clear that that $(1-\varepsilon)\bar{u}^1+\varepsilon\frac{M_1}{M_2}\bar{u}^2\in L^\infty(t_0,T;B(0,M_1))$ for any $\varepsilon\in[0,1]$, which, together with the optimality of $\bar{u}^1$ to $(OP)^{M_1}_{t_0,y_0^1}$, shows that

$$\begin{aligned}0\ &\le\varliminf_{\varepsilon\to0+}\frac{1}{2\varepsilon}\left\{\left\|e^{(T-t_0)\triangle}y_0^1+\int_{t_0}^Te^{(T-s)\triangle}[(1-\varepsilon)\bar{u}^1+\varepsilon\frac{M_1}{M_2}\bar{u}^2]ds-z_d\right\|^2\right.\\&\qquad\left.-\left\|e^{(T-t_0)\triangle}y_0^1+\int_{t_0}^Te^{(T-s)\triangle}\bar{u}^1ds-z_d\right\|^2\right\}\\&=\left\langle e^{(T-t_0)\triangle}y_0^1+\int_{t_0}^Te^{(T-s)\triangle}\bar{u}^1ds-z_d\,,\ \int_{t_0}^Te^{(T-s)\triangle}\left[\frac{M_1}{M_2}\bar{u}^2-\bar{u}^1\right]ds\right\rangle.\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we can prove that

$$0 \le \left\langle e^{(T-t_0)\triangle} y_0^2 + \int_{t_0}^{T} e^{(T-s)\triangle} \bar{u}^2 ds - z_d\,,\ \int_{t_0}^{T} e^{(T-s)\triangle} \left[\frac{M_2}{M_1}\bar{u}^1 - \bar{u}^2\right] ds \right\rangle .$$

Dividing the first inequality above by M_1^2 and the second one by M_2^2, then adding them together, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\langle \frac{e^{(T-t_0)\triangle} y_0^1 - z_d}{M_1} - \frac{e^{(T-t_0)\triangle} y_0^2 - z_d}{M_2}\,,\ \int_{t_0}^{T} e^{(T-s)\triangle} \left[\frac{\bar{u}^2}{M_2} - \frac{\bar{u}^1}{M_1}\right] ds \right\rangle \\ \ge &\left\| \int_{t_0}^{T} e^{(T-s)\triangle} \left[\frac{\bar{u}^2}{M_2} - \frac{\bar{u}^1}{M_1}\right] ds \right\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\left\| \frac{e^{(T-t_0)\triangle} y_0^1 - z_d}{M_1} - \frac{e^{(T-t_0)\triangle} y_0^2 - z_d}{M_2} \right\| \ge \left\| \int_{t_0}^{T} e^{(T-s)\triangle} \left[\frac{\bar{u}^2}{M_2} - \frac{\bar{u}^1}{M_1}\right] ds \right\|. \tag{4.27}$$

Since $(\bar{y}^i, \bar{\psi}^i)$, $i = 1, 2$, solve (4.2) and the semigroup $\{e^{t\triangle} : t \ge 0\}$ is contractive, we can use (4.27) to derive that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \frac{\bar{\psi}^1(t_0)}{M_1} - \frac{\bar{\psi}^2(t_0)}{M_2} \right\| = \left\| e^{(T-t_0)\triangle} \left(\frac{\bar{\psi}^1(T)}{M_1} - \frac{\bar{\psi}^2(T)}{M_2} \right) \right\| \\ \le\ & \left\| \frac{\bar{\psi}^1(T)}{M_1} - \frac{\bar{\psi}^2(T)}{M_2} \right\| = \left\| \frac{\bar{y}^1(T) - z_d}{M_1} - \frac{\bar{y}^2(T) - z_d}{M_2} \right\| \\ \le\ & \left\| \frac{e^{(T-t_0)\triangle} y_0^1 - z_d}{M_1} - \frac{e^{(T-t_0)\triangle} y_0^2 - z_d}{M_2} \right\| + \left\| \int_{t_0}^{T} e^{(T-s)\triangle} \left[\frac{\bar{u}^1}{M_1} - \frac{\bar{u}^2}{M_2}\right] ds \right\| \\ \le\ & \frac{2}{M_1} \|y_0^1 - y_0^2\| + 2(\|y_0^2\| + \|z_d\|) \frac{|M_1 - M_2|}{M_1 M_2}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.28}$$

By direct computation, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathcal{N}(t_0, y_0^1, M_1) - \mathcal{N}(t_0, y_0^2, M_2)\| = \left\| M_1 \frac{\chi_\omega \bar{\psi}^1(t_0)}{\|\chi_\omega \bar{\psi}^1(t_0)\|} - M_2 \frac{\chi_\omega \bar{\psi}^2(t_0)}{\|\chi_\omega \bar{\psi}^2(t_0)\|} \right\| \\ \le\ & M_1 \left\| \frac{\chi_\omega \bar{\psi}^1(t_0)}{\|\chi_\omega \bar{\psi}^1(t_0)\|} - \frac{\chi_\omega \bar{\psi}^2(t_0)}{\|\chi_\omega \bar{\psi}^2(t_0)\|} \right\| + |M_1 - M_2| \left\| \frac{\chi_\omega \bar{\psi}^2(t_0)}{\|\chi_\omega \bar{\psi}^2(t_0)\|} \right\| \\ =\ & \frac{M_1}{\|\frac{\chi_\omega \bar{\psi}^1(t_0)}{M_1}\| \|\frac{\chi_\omega \bar{\psi}^2(t_0)}{M_2}\|} \left\| \left[\|\frac{\chi_\omega \bar{\psi}^2(t_0)}{M_2}\| \frac{\chi_\omega \bar{\psi}^1(t_0)}{M_1} - \|\frac{\chi_\omega \bar{\psi}^1(t_0)}{M_1}\| \frac{\chi_\omega \bar{\psi}^2(t_0)}{M_2} \right] \right\| + |M_1 - M_2| \\ \le\ & \frac{2M_1}{\|\frac{\chi_\omega \bar{\psi}^1(t_0)}{M_1}\| \|\frac{\chi_\omega \bar{\psi}^2(t_0)}{M_2}\|} \left\| \frac{\chi_\omega \bar{\psi}^2(t_0)}{M_2} \right\| \left\| \frac{\chi_\omega \bar{\psi}^1(t_0)}{M_1} - \frac{\chi_\omega \bar{\psi}^2(t_0)}{M_2} \right\| + |M_1 - M_2| \\ \le\ & \frac{2M_1^2}{\|\chi_\omega \bar{\psi}^1(t_0)\|} \left\| \frac{\bar{\psi}^1(t_0)}{M_1} - \frac{\bar{\psi}^2(t_0)}{M_2} \right\| + |M_1 - M_2|. \end{aligned}$$

This, together with (4.28), shows (4.25).

Step 2. When $\bar{M} > 0$, there is $\bar{\rho} > 0$ such that for each $(t_0, y_0, M) \in [(\bar{t}_0 - \bar{\rho})^+, \bar{t}_0 + \bar{\rho}] \times B(\bar{y}_0, \bar{\rho}) \times [\bar{M} - \bar{\rho}, \bar{M}, \bar{\rho}]$,

$$\left\|\chi_\omega \bar{\psi}^M_{t_0,y_0}(t_0)\right\| \geq \frac{1}{2}\left\|\chi_\omega \bar{\psi}^{\bar{M}}_{\bar{t}_0,\bar{y}_0}(\bar{t}_0)\right\| > 0. \tag{4.29}$$

The second inequality in (4.29) follows from (4.3). The first one will be proved by the following two cases:
Case 1: $t_0 \leq \bar{t}_0$. In this case, the following three estimates hold for all $y_0 \in L^2(\Omega)$ and $M \in [\bar{M}/2, (3\bar{M})/2]$:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\bar{\psi}^M_{t_0,y_0}(t_0) - \bar{\psi}^{\bar{M}}_{\bar{t}_0,\bar{y}_0}(\bar{t}_0)\right\| = \left\|e^{(\bar{t}_0 - t_0)\triangle}\bar{\psi}^M_{t_0,y_0}(\bar{t}_0) - \bar{\psi}^{\bar{M}}_{\bar{t}_0,\bar{y}_0}(\bar{t}_0)\right\| \\
\leq\ & \left\|e^{(\bar{t}_0 - t_0)\triangle}\right\| \cdot \left\|\bar{\psi}^M_{t_0,y_0}(\bar{t}_0) - \bar{\psi}^{\bar{M}}_{\bar{t}_0,\bar{y}_0}(\bar{t}_0)\right\| + \left\|e^{(\bar{t}_0 - t_0)\triangle} - I\right\| \cdot \|\bar{\psi}^{\bar{M}}_{\bar{t}_0,\bar{y}_0}(\bar{t}_0)\| \\
\leq\ & \left\|\bar{\psi}^M_{t_0,y_0}(\bar{t}_0) - \bar{\psi}^{\bar{M}}_{\bar{t}_0,\bar{y}_0}(\bar{t}_0)\right\| + \left\|e^{(\bar{t}_0 - t_0)\triangle} - I\right\| \cdot \|\bar{\psi}^{\bar{M}}_{\bar{t}_0,\bar{y}_0}(\bar{t}_0)\|;
\end{aligned}$$

(Here I denotes the identity operator on $L^2(\Omega)$.)

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\bar{\psi}^M_{t_0,y_0}(\bar{t}_0) - \bar{\psi}^{\bar{M}}_{\bar{t}_0,\bar{y}_0}(\bar{t}_0)\right\| = \left\|\bar{\psi}^M_{\bar{t}_0,\bar{y}^M_{t_0,y_0}(\bar{t}_0)}(\bar{t}_0) - \bar{\psi}^{\bar{M}}_{\bar{t}_0,\bar{y}_0}(\bar{t}_0)\right\| \\
\leq\ & M\left\|\frac{\bar{\psi}^M_{\bar{t}_0,\bar{y}^M_{t_0,y_0}(\bar{t}_0)}(\bar{t}_0)}{M} - \frac{\bar{\psi}^{\bar{M}}_{\bar{t}_0,\bar{y}_0}(\bar{t}_0)}{\bar{M}}\right\| + \frac{|M - \bar{M}|}{\bar{M}}\left\|\bar{\psi}^{\bar{M}}_{\bar{t}_0,\bar{y}_0}(\bar{t}_0)\right\| \\
\leq\ & 2\left\|\bar{y}^M_{t_0,y_0}(\bar{t}_0) - \bar{y}_0\right\| + \Big(2\|\bar{y}_0\| + 2\|z_d\| + \left\|\bar{\psi}^{\bar{M}}_{\bar{t}_0,\bar{y}_0}(\bar{t}_0)\right\|\Big)\frac{|M - \bar{M}|}{\bar{M}};
\end{aligned}$$

(Here, (4.8) and (4.28) have been used.) and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\bar{y}^M_{t_0,y_0}(\bar{t}_0) - \bar{y}_0\right\| = \left\|e^{(\bar{t}_0 - t_0)\triangle}y_0 - \bar{y}_0 + \int_{t_0}^{\bar{t}_0} e^{(\bar{t}_0 - s)\triangle}\bar{u}^M_{t_0,y_0}(s)ds\right\| \\
\leq\ & \left\|e^{(\bar{t}_0 - t_0)\triangle}\right\| \cdot \|y_0 - \bar{y}_0\| + \left\|e^{(\bar{t}_0 - t_0)\triangle} - I\right\| \cdot \|\bar{y}_0\| + \int_{t_0}^{\bar{t}_0}\left\|e^{(\bar{t}_0 - s)\triangle}\right\| \cdot \left\|\bar{u}^M_{t_0,y_0}(s)\right\| ds \\
\leq\ & \|y_0 - \bar{y}_0\| + \left\|e^{(\bar{t}_0 - t_0)\triangle} - I\right\| \cdot \|\bar{y}_0\| + M(\bar{t}_0 - t_0).
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the above-mentioned three inequalities together leads to

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\|\bar\psi^{M}_{t_0,y_0}(t_0)-\bar\psi^{\bar M}_{\bar t_0,\bar y_0}(\bar t_0)\right\| \leq 2\|y_0-\bar y_0\|+2M(\bar t_0-t_0)\\ &+\left\|e^{(\bar t_0-t_0)\triangle}-I\right\|\cdot\Big(2\|\bar y_0\|+\|\bar\psi^{\bar M}_{\bar t_0,\bar y_0}(\bar t_0)\|\Big)\\ &+\Big(2\|\bar y_0\|+2\|z_d\|+\left\|\bar\psi^{\bar M}_{\bar t_0,\bar y_0}(\bar t_0)\right\|\Big)\frac{|M-\bar M|}{\bar M}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.30}$$

Clearly, the right hand side of (4.30) is continuous with respect to (t_0, y_0, M). This, along with the second inequality in (4.29), indicates that there exists a ρ_1 with

$$0<\rho_1<\frac{T-\bar t_0}{2}\wedge\frac{\bar M}{2},$$

such that for each $(t_0, y_0, M) \in [(\bar t_0-\rho_1)^+, \bar t_0]\times B(\bar y_0,\rho_1)\times[\bar M-\rho_1,\bar M+\rho_1]$,

$$\left\|\bar\psi^{M}_{t_0,y_0}(t_0)-\bar\psi^{\bar M}_{\bar t_0,\bar y_0}(\bar t_0)\right\|\leq\frac{1}{2}\left\|\bar\psi^{\bar M}_{\bar t_0,\bar y_0}(\bar t_0)\right\|, \tag{4.31}$$

Case 2: $t_0 \geq \bar t_0$. In this case, the following two estimates hold for all $y_0 \in L^2(\Omega)$ and $M \in [\bar M/2, (3\bar M)/2]$:

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\|\bar\psi^{M}_{t_0,y_0}(t_0)-\bar\psi^{\bar M}_{\bar t_0,\bar y_0}(t_0)\right\|\\ \leq\;& M\left\|\frac{\bar\psi^{M}_{t_0,y_0}(t_0)}{M}-\frac{\bar\psi^{\bar M}_{\bar t_0,\bar y_0}(t_0)}{\bar M}\right\|+\frac{|M-\bar M|}{\bar M}\left\|\bar\psi^{\bar M}_{\bar t_0,\bar y_0}(t_0)\right\|\\ =\;& M\left\|\frac{\bar\psi^{M}_{t_0,y_0}(t_0)}{M}-\frac{\bar\psi^{\bar M}_{t_0,\bar y^{\bar M}_{\bar t_0,\bar y_0}(t_0)}(t_0)}{\bar M}\right\|+\frac{|M-\bar M|}{\bar M}\left\|\bar\psi^{\bar M}_{\bar t_0,\bar y_0}(t_0)\right\|\\ \leq\;& 2\left\|y_0-\bar y^{\bar M}_{\bar t_0,\bar y_0}(t_0)\right\|+\Big(2\left\|\bar y^{\bar M}_{\bar t_0,\bar y_0}(t_0)\right\|+2\|z_d\|+\left\|\bar\psi^{\bar M}_{\bar t_0,\bar y_0}(t_0)\right\|\Big)\frac{|M-\bar M|}{\bar M} \end{aligned}$$

(Here, (4.8) and (4.28) have been used.) and

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\|\bar y^{\bar M}_{\bar t_0,\bar y_0}(t_0)-y_0\right\|=\left\|e^{(t_0-\bar t_0)\triangle}\bar y_0-y_0+\int_{\bar t_0}^{t_0}e^{(t_0-s)\triangle}\bar u^{\bar M}_{\bar t_0,\bar y_0}(s)ds\right\|\\ =\;&\left\|e^{(t_0-\bar t_0)\triangle}\bar y_0-y_0+\int_{\bar t_0}^{t_0}e^{(t_0-s)\triangle}\bar u^{\bar M}_{\bar t_0,\bar y_0}(s)ds\right\|\\ \leq\;&\left\|e^{(\bar t_0-t_0)\triangle}-I\right\|\cdot\|\bar y_0\|+\|y_0-\bar y_0\|+\int_{\bar t_0}^{t_0}\|e^{(t_0-s)\triangle}\|\cdot\left\|\bar u^{\bar M}_{\bar t_0,\bar y_0}(s)\right\|ds\\ \leq\;&\|y_0-\bar y_0\|+\left\|e^{(\bar t_0-t_0)\triangle}-I\right\|\cdot\|\bar y_0\|+\bar M(t_0-\bar t_0). \end{aligned}$$

From the above-mentioned two estimates, we derive that

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\|\bar{\psi}^{M}_{t_0,y_0}(t_0)-\bar{\psi}^{\bar{M}}_{\bar{t}_0,\bar{y}_0}(\bar{t}_0)\right\| \leq 2\|y_0-\bar{y}_0\|+2\bar{M}(\bar{t}_0-t_0)+2\left\|e^{(t_0-\bar{t}_0)\triangle}-I\right\|\cdot\|\bar{y}_0\|\\ &+\left(2\left\|\bar{y}^{\bar{M}}_{\bar{t}_0,\bar{y}_0}(t_0)\right\|+\left\|\bar{\psi}^{\bar{M}}_{\bar{t}_0,\bar{y}_0}(\bar{t}_0)\right\|+2\|z_d\|\right)\frac{|M-\bar{M}|}{\bar{M}}+\left\|\bar{\psi}^{\bar{M}}_{\bar{t}_0,\bar{y}_0}(t_0)-\bar{\psi}^{\bar{M}}_{\bar{t}_0,\bar{y}_0}(\bar{t}_0)\right\|\end{aligned} \tag{4.32}$$

By the same argument used to get (4.31) (notice the continuity of $\bar{\psi}^{\bar{M}}_{\bar{t}_0,\bar{y}_0}(\cdot)$), we can find a ρ_2 with $0<\rho_2<\dfrac{T-\bar{t}_0}{2}\wedge\dfrac{\bar{M}}{2}$, such that for each triplet $(t_0,y_0,M)\in[\bar{t}_0,\bar{t}_0+\rho_2]\times B(\bar{y}_0),\rho_2)\times[\bar{M}-\rho_2,\bar{M}+\rho_2]$,

$$\left\|\bar{\psi}^{M}_{t_0,y_0}(t_0)-\bar{\psi}^{\bar{M}}_{\bar{t}_0,\bar{y}_0}(\bar{t}_0)\right\|\leq\frac{1}{2}\left\|\bar{\psi}^{\bar{M}}_{\bar{t}_0,\bar{y}_0}(\bar{t}_0)\right\|. \tag{4.33}$$

Now we set $\bar{\rho}=\rho_1\wedge\rho_2$. Then the first inequality of (4.29) follows from (4.31) and (4.33).

Step 3. When $\bar{M}=0$, there is $\bar{\rho}>0$ such that for each $t_0\in[(\bar{t}_0-\bar{\rho})^+,\bar{t}_0+\bar{\rho}]$, each $y_0\in B(\bar{y}_0,\bar{\rho})$ and each $M\in[0,\bar{\rho}]$,

$$\left\|\chi_\omega\bar{\psi}^{M}_{t_0,y_0}(t_0)\right\|\geq\frac{1}{2}\left\|\chi_\omega\bar{\psi}^{0}_{\bar{t}_0,\bar{y}_0}(\bar{t}_0)\right\|>0. \tag{4.34}$$

The second inequality in (4.34) follows from (4.3). The remainder is to show the first one. The following two inequalities can be checked by direct computation:

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\|\bar{\psi}^{M}_{t_0,y_0}(t_0)-\bar{\psi}^{0}_{t_0,\bar{y}_0}(t_0)\right\|=\left\|e^{(T-\bar{t}_0)\triangle}\left[\bar{\psi}^{M}_{t_0,y_0}(T)-\bar{\psi}^{0}_{t_0,\bar{y}_0}(T)\right]\right\|\\ =\;&\left\|e^{(T-\bar{t}_0)\triangle}\left[\bar{y}^{M}_{t_0,y_0}(T)-\bar{y}^{0}_{t_0,\bar{y}_0}(T)\right]\right\|\leq\left\|\bar{y}^{M}_{t_0,y_0}(T)-\bar{y}^{0}_{t_0,\bar{y}_0}(T)\right\|\\ =\;&\left\|e^{(T-t_0)\triangle}(y_0-\bar{y}_0)+\int_{t_0}^{T}e^{(T-s)\triangle}\bar{u}^{M}_{t_0,y_0}(s)ds\right\|\\ \leq\;&\|y_0-\bar{y}_0\|+M(T-t_0)\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\|\bar{\psi}^{0}_{t_0,\bar{y}_0}(t_0)-\bar{\psi}^{0}_{\bar{t}_0,\bar{y}_0}(\bar{t}_0)\right\|\\ =\;&\left\|\left[e^{2(T-t_0)\triangle}-e^{2(T-\bar{t}_0)\triangle}\right]\bar{y}_0+\left[e^{(T-t_0)\triangle}-e^{(T-\bar{t}_0)\triangle}\right]z_d\right\|\\ \leq\;&\left\|e^{2(|t_0-\bar{t}_0|)\triangle}-I\right\|\|\bar{y}_0\|+\left[e^{(|t_0-\bar{t}_0|)\triangle}-I\right]\|z_d\|.\end{aligned}$$

From these, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\|\bar{\psi}^{M}_{t_0,y_0}(t_0)-\bar{\psi}^{0}_{\bar{t}_0,\bar{y}_0}(\bar{t}_0)\right\|\\ \leq\;&\left\|\bar{\psi}^{M}_{t_0,y_0}(t_0)-\bar{\psi}^{0}_{t_0,\bar{y}_0}(t_0)\right\|+\left\|\bar{\psi}^{0}_{t_0,\bar{y}_0}(t_0)-\bar{\psi}^{0}_{\bar{t}_0,\bar{y}_0}(\bar{t}_0)\right\|\\ \leq\;&\|y_0-\bar{y}_0\|+M(T-t_0)+\left\|e^{2(|t_0-\bar{t}_0|)\triangle}-I\right\|\|\bar{y}_0\|+\left[e^{(|t_0-\bar{t}_0|)\triangle}-I\right]\|z_d\|.\end{aligned} \tag{4.35}$$

Clearly, the right hand side of (4.35) is continuous with respect to t_0, y_0 and M. This, together with the second inequality of (4.34), yields that there exists $\bar{\rho} \in (0, \frac{T-\bar{t}_0}{2})$ such that for each $(t_0, y_0, M) \in [(\bar{t}_0 - \bar{\rho})^+, \bar{t}_0 + \bar{\rho}] \times B(\bar{y}_0, \bar{\rho}) \times [0, \bar{\rho}]$,

$$\left\|\bar{\psi}^M_{t_0,y_0}(t_0) - \bar{\psi}^0_{\bar{t}_0,\bar{y}_0}(\bar{t}_0)\right\| \leq \frac{1}{2}\left\|\bar{\psi}^0_{\bar{t}_0,\bar{y}_0}(\bar{t}_0)\right\|,$$

from which, the first inequality in (4.34) follows at once.

Step 4. The required Lipschitz continuity of the map $\mathcal{N}$

Clearly, we can take the same constant $\bar{\rho}$ in Step 2 and Step 3 such that (4.29) and (4.34) stand. When $\bar{M} = 0$, it follows from (4.25), (4.26) and (4.34) that the map $\mathcal{N}(t_0, \cdot, \cdot)$ is Lipschitz continuous over $B(y_0, \bar{\rho}) \times [(\bar{M} - \bar{\rho})^+, \bar{M} + \bar{\rho}]$ uniformly with respect to $t_0 \in [(\bar{t}_0 - \bar{\rho})^+, \bar{t}_0 + \bar{\rho}]$; When $\bar{M} > 0$, the same conclusion follows from (4.25), (4.26) and (4.29).

(ii) Fix a $\bar{y}_0 \in L^2(\Omega)$. Let $(\bar{M}, \bar{t}_0) \in [0, \infty) \times [0, T)$. Since $\|\chi_\omega \bar{\psi}^{\bar{M}}_{\bar{t}_0,\bar{y}_0}(\bar{t}_0)\| \neq 0$ (see (4.3)), the continuity of the map $(t_0, M) \to \mathcal{N}(t_0, \bar{y}_0, M)$ at $(\bar{t}_0, \bar{M})$ follows from the continuity of the map $(t_0, M) \to \bar{\psi}^M_{t_0,\bar{y}_0}(t_0)$ at $(\bar{t}_0, \bar{M})$. When $\bar{M} > 0$, the continuity of the map $(t_0, M) \to \bar{\psi}^M_{t_0,\bar{y}_0}(t_0)$ at $(\bar{t}_0, \bar{M})$ follows from (4.30) and (4.32). When $\bar{M} = 0$, the continuity of this map at $(\bar{t}_0, \bar{M})$ follows from (4.35). Thus, $\mathcal{N}(\cdot, \bar{y}_0, \cdot)$ is continuous over $[0, T) \times [0, \infty)$.

In summary, we complete the proof. □

Proof of Proposition 4.7. *(i)* Let $(\bar{t}_0, \bar{y}_0) \in [0, T) \times L^2(\Omega)$. By the definition of maps $\mathcal{N}$ and F (see (4.4) and (4.24)), we see that

$$F(t_0, y_0) = \mathcal{N}(t_0, y_0, N(t_0, y_0)) \text{ for all } (t_0, y_0) \in [0, T) \times L^2(\Omega). \tag{4.36}$$

According to Lemma 4.11, there are $\bar{\rho}_1 > 0$ and $C_1 > 0$ such that when (t_0, y_0^1, M_1) and (t_0, y_0^2, M_2) belong to $[(\bar{t}_0 - \bar{\rho}_1)^+, \bar{t}_0 + \bar{\rho}_1] \times B(\bar{y}_0, \bar{\rho}_1) \times [(\bar{M} - \bar{\rho}_1)^+, \bar{M} + \bar{\rho}_1]$,

$$\|\mathcal{N}(t_0, y_0^1, M_1) - \mathcal{N}(t_0, y_0^2, M_2)\| \leq C_1\Big(\|y_0^1 - y_0^2\| + |M_1 - M_2|\Big). \tag{4.37}$$

According to Lemma 4.10, there are $\bar{\rho}_2 > 0$ and $C_2 > 0$ such that

$$|N(t_0, y_0^1) - N(t_0, y_0^2)| \leq C_2\|y_0^1 - y_0^2\|,$$

for all (t_0, y_0^1) and (t_0, y_0^2) belong to $[(\bar{t}_0 - \bar{\delta})^+, \bar{t}_0 + \bar{\delta}] \times B(\bar{y}_0, \bar{\rho}_2)$, where $\bar{\delta} = (T - \bar{t}_0)/2$.

Let $\bar{\rho} = \min\{\bar{\rho}_1, \bar{\rho}_2, \frac{\bar{\rho}_1}{2C_2}, \bar{\delta}\}$. Then it follows from the above inequality that

$$|N(t_0, y_0^1) - N(t_0, \bar{y}_0^2)| \leq 2C_2\bar{\rho} \leq \bar{\rho}_1 \text{ for all } y_0^1, y_0^2 \in B(\bar{y}_0, \bar{\rho}) \text{ and } t_0 \in [(\bar{t}_0 - \bar{\rho})^+, \bar{t}_0 + \bar{\rho}].$$

This, along with (4.37), indicates that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|F(t_0,y_0^1)-F(t_0,y_0^2)\|\\
&=\|\mathcal{N}(t_0,y_0^1,N(t_0,y_0^1))-\mathcal{N}(t_0,y_0^2,N(t_0,y_0^2))\|\\
&\leq C_1\Big(\|y_0^1-y_0^2\|+|N(t_0,y_0^1)-N(t_0,y_0^2)|\Big)\\
&\leq C_1\Big(\|y_0^1-y_0^2\|+C_2\|y_0^1-y_0^2\|\Big)=C_1(1+C_2)\|y_0^1-y_0^2\|
\end{aligned}$$

for all $y_0^1, y_0^2 \in B(\bar{y}_0, \bar{\rho})$ and $t_0 \in [(\bar{t}_0-\bar{\rho})^+, \bar{t}_0+\bar{\rho}]$. The desired Lipschitz continuity follows from the above inequality at once.
(ii) Let $\bar{y}_0 \in L^2(\Omega)$. Since $F(t_0,\bar{y}_0)=\mathcal{N}(t_0,\bar{y}_0,N(t_0,\bar{y}_0))$ for all $t_0 \in [0,T)$ (see (4.36)), the desired continuity of $F(\cdot,\bar{y}_0)$ follows directly from the continuity of $N(\cdot,\bar{y}_0)$ and $\mathcal{N}(\cdot,\bar{y}_0,\cdot)$.

In summary, we complete the proof. $\square$

4.4 Proof of Theorem 4.2

Proof of Theorem 4.2. Let $(t_0,y_0) \in [0,T)\times L^2(\Omega)$. By theorem 4.1, $\bar{y}_{t_0,y_0}^{N(t_0,y_0)}(\cdot)$ is the unique solution to Equation (4.5), i.e., $y_F(\cdot;t_0,y_0)=\bar{y}_{t_0,y_0}^{N(t_0,y_0)}(\cdot)$ over $[t_0,T)$. Then, by (4.4), (4.14), (4.8) and (4.10), we see that

$$F\Big(t,y_F(t;t_0,y_0)\Big)=F\left(t,\bar{y}_{t_0,y_0}^{N(t_0,y_0)}(t)\right)=N(t_0,y_0)\frac{\chi_\omega\bar{\psi}_{t_0,y_0}^{N(t_0,y_0)}(t)}{\|\chi_\omega\bar{\psi}_{t_0,y_0}^{N(t_0,y_0)}(t)\|}=\bar{u}_{t_0,y_0}^{N(t_0,y_0)}(t),\quad \forall\, t\in(t_0,T).$$

Since $\bar{u}_{t_0,y_0}^{N(t_0,y_0)}(\cdot)$ is optimal norm control for Problem $(NP)_{t_0,y_0}$ (see Lemma4.5), the above equality implies that $F(\cdot;y_F(\cdot;t_0,y_0)$ is the optimal control to $(NP)_{t_0,y_0}$. This completes the proof. $\square$

References

[1] M. Bardi, Boundary value problem for the minimum time function, SIAM J. Control Optim., Vol 27 (1989) 776-785.

[2] O. Carja, The minimal time function in infinite dimensions, SIAM J. Control Optim. Vol. 31, No. 5 (1993), 1103-1114.

[3] T. Duyckaerts, X. Zhang, E. Zuazua, On the optimality of the observability inequalities for parabolic and hyperbolic systems with potentials, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire 25 (2008), 1-41.

[4] C. Fabre, J.-P. Puel and E. Zuazua, Approximate controllability of the semilinear heat equation, Proc.Royal Soc.Edinburgh, 125 A (1995), 31-61.

[5] H. O. Fattorini, Infinite Dimensional Linear Control Systems, The Time Optimal and Norm Optimal Problems, North-Holland Mathematics Studies 201, ELSEVIER, 2005.

[6] E. Fernandez-Cara and E. Zuazua, Null and approximate controllability for weakly blowing-up semilinear heat equations, Annales Inst. Henri Poincare, Analyse nonlineaire, 17 (5) (2000), 5 83-616.

[7] F. Gozzi and P. Loreti, Regularity of the minimum time function and minimum energy problems: The linear case, SIAM J. Control Optim. Vol. 37, No. 4 (1999), 1195-1221.

[8] F. H. Lin, A uniqueness theorem for the parabolic equation, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 43 (1990), 127-136.

[9] J. L. Lions, Optimal control of systems governed by partial differential equations. Translated from the French by S. K. Mitter. Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 170 Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 1971.

[10] X. Li and J. Yong, Optimal Control Theory for Infinite Dimensional Systems, Birkhauser Boston, Boston, MA, 1995.

[11] Mizel, V., Seidman, T.: An abstract 'bang-bang principle' and time optimal boundary control of the heat equation, SIAM J. Control Optim. **35** (1997), 1204–1216

[12] K. D. Phung and G. Wang, Quantitative unique continuation for the semilinear heat equations in a convex domain, Journal of Functional Analysis, 259(5) (2010), 1230-1247.

[13] G. Wang and E. Zuazua, On the equivalence between time and norm optimal controls for heat equations, preprint.

[14] G. S. Wang, L^∞-null controllability for the heat equation and its consequences for the time optimal control problem, SIAM, J. Control Optim. Vol. 47, No. 4 (2008) 1701-1720.

[15] E. Zeidler, Nonlinear functional Analysis and its application. I. Fixed-point theorem. Translated from German by Peter R. Wadsack. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1986.